DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 268 HE 004 895

AUTHOR	Golden, Deborah; And Others
TITLE	Students in Schools of Social Work. A Study of Characteristics and Factors Affecting Career Choice and Practice Concentration.
INSTITUTION	Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	96p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Choice; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Professional Education; *Social Work; Social Workers; *Student Characteristics; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This book is a report of a comprehensive survey made in 1966 of first-year graduate social work students. The survey gathered information about (1) the age, sex, race, religion, socioeconomic status, and prior education and academic achievements of these students; (2) the factors that bring people into social work and lead them to undertake graduate professional education, with special attention to the impact of work experience in social work and related areas, the nation's and profession's current emphasis on broad social issues, and the increasingly active and organized recruitment efforts of the social work profession; (3) the post-graduation career plans of the entering class; (4) financial aid for first-year graduate students; and (5) the elements involved in method concentration selection both in relation to the career and method choice process and the differences among the students in various methods. Wherever possible, comparison of this study was made with a similar study performed in 1960. (Author)

ED 087268

STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

A Study of Characteristics and Factors Affecting Career Choice and Practice Concentration

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council on Social Work Education
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

ED 087268

STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

A Study of Characteristics and Factors Affecting Career Choice and Practice Concentration

Deborah Golden
Arnulf M. Pins
Wyatt Jones

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
345 East 46th Street New York, N.Y. 10017

Copyright © 1972 by the
Council on Social Work Education

Library of Congress No. 79-138372

Preface

This volume, along with several other publications, is the result of a three-year comprehensive study of the community-organization curriculum in graduate social work education sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education.

This book, *Students in Schools of Social Work: A Study of Characteristics and Factors Affecting Career Choice and Practice Concentration*, by Deborah Golden, Arnulf M. Pins, and Wyatt Jones, contains the results of a 1966 survey on first-year graduate students in schools of social work. The findings of this study are compared in many instances to those of the first comprehensive study of graduate social work students conducted in 1960 (Arnulf M. Pins, *Who Chooses Social Work When and Why*, CSWE, 1963).

Other publications resulting from this community-organization curriculum study include an overview, *Community Organization Curriculum in Graduate Social Work Education: Report and Recommendations*, by Arnold Gurin (published by CSWE, 1970); a textbook, *Community Organization and Social Planning*, by Arnold Gurin and Robert Perlman (co-published by CSWE and John Wiley and Sons, 1972); a casebook, *Community Organizers and Social Planners*, by John Levin Ecklein and Armand A. Lauffer (co-published by CSWE and John Wiley and Sons, 1971); and *A New Look at Field Instruction: Education for Application of Practice Skills in Community Organization and Social Planning* by Jack Rothman and Wyatt Jones (co-published by CSWE and Association Press, 1971). The findings, recommendations, and new resources produced by the Community Organization Curriculum Development Project should be of value to faculty, students, and practitioners in social work and other professions.

Thanks are expressed to the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose grant made this project possible.

LILIAN RIPPLE
Acting Executive Director

May, 1972

Table of Contents

PREFACE iii

CHAPTER I
Introduction 1

CHAPTER II
Characteristics of Social Work Students 7

CHAPTER III
Career Choice 23

CHAPTER IV
Method Choice 40

CHAPTER V
Post-Graduation Plans 44

CHAPTER VI
Financing of Graduate Education 48

CHAPTER VII
The No Concentration, Undecided, and Other Method Students 54

CHAPTER VIII
General Summary of Findings 59

APPENDIX—Student Questionnaire—1966 66

List of Tables

TABLE 1. Percentage of students by sex—1960 and 1966 7
TABLE 2. Percentage of students by sex and by method—1960 and 1966 8
TABLE 3. Percentage of students by age upon entry into graduate school—1960 and 1966 8
TABLE 4. Percentage of students by age at college graduation—1966 9
TABLE 5. Percentage of students by interval between college graduation and graduate school entry—1960 and 1966 9
TABLE 6. Percentage of students by age at graduate school entry and by method—1960 and 1966 10
TABLE 7. Percentage of students by marital status—1960 and 1966 10
TABLE 8. Percentage of students by number of children—1960 and 1966 11
TABLE 9. Percentage of students by religious affiliation—1960 and 1966 11
TABLE 10. Percentage of students by religious affiliation and by method —1960 and 1966 12
TABLE 11. Percentage of students by race—1960 and 1966 12
TABLE 12. Percentage of students by race and by method—1960 and 1966 13
TABLE 13. Percentage of students by regional origins—1960 and 1966 13
TABLE 14. Percentage of students by regional origins and by method —1960 and 1966 14
TABLE 15. Percentage of students by size of home community—1966 14
TABLE 16. Percentage of students by size of home community and by method—1960 and 1966 15
TABLE 17. Percentage of students by fathers' occupations—1960 and 1966 15
TABLE 18. Percentage of students by fathers' occupations and by method —1960 and 1966 16
TABLE 19. Percentage of students by highest level of education achieved by parents—1960 and 1966 16
TABLE 20. Percentage of students by family income—1960 and 1966 17
TABLE 21. Percentage of students by family income compared to U.S. population—1966 17
TABLE 22. Percentage of students by socio-economic class—1966 18
TABLE 23. Percentage of students by type of undergraduate institution attended—1960 and 1966 18
TABLE 24. Percentage of students by degree of selectivity of undergraduate institution attend—1966 social work students and total undergraduate population 19
TABLE 25. Percentage of students by selectivity of institutions and by method—1966 19

TABLE 26. Percentage of students by undergraduate major subject—1960 and 1966 20
TABLE 27. Percentage of students by number of psychology and sociology college courses taken—1960 and 1966 20
TABLE 28. Percentage of students by grade point average for upperclass years—1960 and 1966 21
TABLE 29. Percentage of students by academic performance index—comparison of 1966 social work students and NORC study undergraduates
TABLE 30. Percentage of students by time of awareness of social work as a career—1960 and 1966 23
TABLE 31. Percentage of students by time of awareness of social work as a career and by method—1960 and 1966 24
TABLE 32. Percentage of students by time of consideration of social work as a potential career—1960 and 1966 24
TABLE 33. Percentage of students by time of consideration of social work as a potential career and by method—1960 and 1966 25
TABLE 34. Percentage of students by time of decision to enter social work—1960 and 1966 25
TABLE 35. Percentage of students by time of decision to enter social work and by method—1960 and 1966 26
TABLE 36. Percentage of students by major sources for learning about social work—1960 and 1966 26
TABLE 37. Percentage of students by major sources for learning about social work and by method—1960 and 1966 27
TABLE 38. Percentage of students by most important factors influencing career choice—1960 and 1966 28
TABLE 39. Percentage of students by most important factors influencing career choice and by method—1960 and 1966 28
TABLE 40. Percentage of students with prior work experience in specific fields of practice—1960 and 1966 29
TABLE 41. Percentage of students by extent of prior work experience —1966 30
TABLE 42. Percentage of students by extent of prior work experience and by method—1966 30
TABLE 43. Percentage of students by extent of organization participation—1960 and 1966 31
TABLE 44. Percentage of students by extent of organziation participation and by method—1960 and 1966 32
TABLE 45. Percentage of students by amount of leadership activity—1960 and 1966
TABLE 46. Percentage of students by amount of leadership activity and by method—1960 and 1966 32
TABLE 47. Percentage of students belonging to specified types of organizations—1966 33
TABLE 48. Percentage of students belonging to specified types of organizations according to method—1966 33
TABLE 49. Percentage of students by participation in recruitment activities—1966 35

TABLE 50. Percentage of students with relatives and friends in social work—1966 36
TABLE 51. Percentage of students who considered other careers by extent of involvement in them—1966 37
TABLE 52. Percentage of students who considered other careers by method—1960 and 1966 37
TABLE 53. Percentage of students rejecting other careers by reasons for rejection—1960 and 1966 38
TABLE 54. Percentage of students by pattern of reasons for choosing social work—1960 and 1966 38
TABLE 55. Percentage of students by methods selected—1960 and 1966 41
TABLE 56. Percentage of students by time of method choice—1960 and 1966 41
TABLE 57. Percentage of students by time of method choice and by method—1960 and 1966 42
TABLE 58. Percentage of students by reason for method choice—total population and by method—1966
TABLE 59. Percentage of students indicating awareness of other methods—total population and by method—1966 43
TABLE 60. Percentage of students by field of practice for entry upon graduation—1966 45
TABLE 61. Percentage of students by level of practice upon graduation and at peak of career—1966 45
TABLE 62. Percentage of students by agency auspices of anticipated first job—by total population and by method—1966 46
TABLE 63. Percentage of students by salary expectations upon graduation—total population and by method—1966 47
TABLE 64. Percentage of students utilizing specified methods of meeting cost of education—1960 and 1966 49
TABLE 65. Percentage of students utilizing one or more sources of financing—1966 49
TABLE 66. Percentage of students by amount of financial aid received—1960 and 1966 49
TABLE 67. Percentage of students by sources of financial aid—1960 and 1966 50
TABLE 68. Percentage distribution of students with stipend commitments by area of practice limitations—1966
TABLE 69. Percentage of students by nature of employment limitations—1966 51
TABLE 70. Percentage of students by indication of difficulty in attending graduate school without financial aid—1960 and 1966 52
TABLE 71. Percentage of students according to reason for not attending graduate school immediately upon college graduation—1966 52
TABLE 72. Percentage of students in other methods by age at graduate school entry—1966 55
TABLE 73. Percentage of students in other methods by religious affiliation 55
TABLE 74. Percentage of students in other methods by API—1966 56

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

BACKGROUND OF STUDY

The first national comprehensive study of students in schools of social work was conducted in 1960.[1] In that study all first-year students in accredited graduate schools of social work throughout the United States and Canada were surveyed. The findings of that survey yielded previously unavailable data on the following:

1. Personal, socio-economic, and academic characteristics of persons undertaking professional social work education and differences in these characteristics among students concentrating their studies in the casework, community organization, and group work methods.
2. Factors influencing the choice of social work and differences in these factors among those concentrating their studies in the various methods.
3. The timing of the decision to enter social work and to study a particular method within the field and the differences in timing for casework, community organization, and group work students.

In 1966, in connection with a major three year community organization curriculum development study, the Council on Social Work Education again surveyed first-year graduate students in a study comparable to, but somewhat broader in scope than the 1960 one. As the CSWE Community Organization Curriculum Development Project had, as one of its objectives, increasing the number of students choosing to concentrate their studies in the community organization method,[2] the project staff desired to understand more fully the process and timing of social work method choice, to obtain a profile of the characteristics of students selecting community organization, and to determine whether such students, who, in 1966, represented over eight percent of the first-year master's degree candidates in contrast to about one and one-half percent of the comparable group in 1960, differed substantially from those individuals con-

[1] Arnulf M. Pins, *Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why: An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing Career Choices in Social Work* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1963). All subsequent references in Chapters 1 through 5 to the Pins or 1960 study refer to this work.

[2] Arnold Gurin, *Community Organization Curriculum in Graduate Social Work Education: Report and Recommendations* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970).

centrating in other methods and from the 1960 community organization students.

It was also recognized that the profession's understanding of its manpower situation and its ability to anticipate future needs and problems in this sphere would be enhanced by a periodic compilation of data similar to that collected in the 1960 study as well as through exploration of new but related areas.[3] Thus, the 1966 study was designed to obtain information concerning the personal, socio-economic, and academic backgrounds of the first-year social work student population and the interrelationships among some of these elements: important aspects of the career and method choice process; the financial assistance required and received by first-year students; and some aspects of the vocational aspirations of social work students at the point they commenced their professional education.[4]

It was assumed that the many substantial changes which have occurred in the nation's social climate and in social work itself since 1960 would be reflected in the backgrounds, past achievements, motivations, and interests of students matriculating for the master's degree in social work in 1966. Therefore, an effort was made to measure the impact on the composition of the social work graduate student body of the country's heightened social consciousness which began with the New Frontier and moved into the Great Society and included the development of the Peace Corps, Vista, and the whole network of antipoverty programs, and changes in the civil rights movement.

In addition, the study was designed to make some determination of the influences on the type of students coming into social work and on the career selection process of the following recent changes in the social work profession:

1. The increased opportunities for people to learn about social work through greater organization of recruitment efforts.
2. The increase in the number of schools of social work and their enrollment and the greater availability of financial aid.
3. The strengthening of the profession's involvement with the most disadvantaged segment of society and its resultant stress on the community organization approach and social action techniques in an effort to find ways to service this group more effectively, an orientation which might conceivably bring people into social work who would otherwise be unaware of or reject it as a potential career.[5]

---

[3] *Closing the Gap in Social Work Manpower* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965), p. 139.

[4] The findings on financial aid to the 1960 students as well as earlier groups of students appear in: Arnulf M. Pins, *Financial Aid to Social Work Students* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1965).

[5] Arnulf M. Pins, "Development of Social Work Recruitment: A Historical Review," *The Social Service Review*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (March, 1965).

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

In line with its origins, the following major objectives were formulated for the study:

1. The development of a comprehensive picture of the characteristics of the recent social work student population, with particular emphasis on the age, sex, race, religion, socio-economic status, and prior education and academic achievements of the students.
2. The extension of knowledge and understanding of the factors which bring people into social work and lead them to undertake graduate professional education, with special attention to the impact of work experience in social work and related areas, the nation's and profession's current emphasis on broad social issues, and the increasingly active and organized recruitment efforts of the social work profession.
3. The determination, in greater depth than was attempted in the 1960 study, of the elements involved in method concentration selection both in relation to the career and method choice process and the differences among the students in various methods.
4. The development of a picture of the post-graduation career plans of the entering class.
5. The gathering of information pertaining to financial aid for first-year graduate students.
6. Wherever possible, the comparison of the findings of the 1966 study with the 1960 study and other relevant research.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This particular study relied on the students' own reporting of their reasons for entering social work and did not attempt to analyze objectively the personality structures, value systems, or underlying motivations which led to this decision. Although it was apparent from the inception of the study that consideration of the above matters would be most pertinent and highly valuable with respect to understanding the kinds of people coming into the profession and the processes bringing them into it, in view of time and cost restrictions, it proved to be too difficult to formulate a concise, relevant, and meaningful measuring instrument related to these areas.

The study also does not investigate many population groups which could provide important data relevant to career choice in social work. Such groups would include those interested in social work but who never pursue it as a career, individuals who were to some extent studied by Galen Gockel in *Silk Stockings and Blue Collars*,[6] individuals who apply to

[6] Galen L. Gockel, *Silk Stockings and Blue Collars* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1966).

schools of social work but are rejected or do not attend despite acceptance, and those who are employed in social welfare but do not secure professional education. Despite the added dimension to be gained from their inclusion, it was decided that the incorporation of any or all of these various groups was beyond the scope and resources of this study.

Finally, there is no provision for following the progress of the students through the course of their professional education and beyond. For instance, no way is provided to compare a student's responses upon entry into graduate school with those he makes upon graduation or to make correlations between what a particular group of students said about themselves when they entered school and what happened to them. The desire, initially, to insure confidentiality of the responses made it impossible to plan for individual follow-up.

METHODOLOGY

The method of approach successfully utilized by Pins in 1960 was essentially duplicated in the 1966 study.[7] First, all first-year, full-time students in the United States and Canada in the seventy-one schools of social work accredited at that time by the Council on Social Work Education were surveyed. The finite nature, relatively reasonable size, and easy accessibility of the target population made it possible to approach the total group to be studied, thereby eliminating the need to select a sample. Most students were studied immediately prior to or at the beginning of formal classes so as to eliminate as much as possible any potential contamination of the responses by the educational experience.

Questionnaires were utilized as the measuring instrument due to their proved effectiveness in the 1960 study with respect to ease of administration, return rate, and acquisition of required information. The content of the questionnaire was similar to the Pins study in order to permit extensive comparisons between the two surveys. However, some portions were altered or expanded and new areas were added to provide particular data needed for the present study.

The schools of social work, whose cooperation was initially enlisted during the spring of 1966, assumed responsibility for distributing the questionnaires to and collecting them from the students, and then sending them on to the Council on Social Work Education. This was a crucial factor in the high percentage of questionnaires returned. Through the utilization of a procedure devised in advance, the schools, without violating confidentiality, were also able to indicate students who had not turned in questionnaires and these individuals were followed up once by letter.

---

[7] For additional information with respect to the development and rationale for the research design, see *Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why, op. cit.*, pp. 11-15.

All questionnaires used in the study were reviewed by the chief investigator for interpretation and coding of written-in, unclear, grossly inconsistent, or irrelevant answers. Questionnaires were then coded for punching by individuals especially trained for this purpose. The data were analyzed through utilization of suitable computer technology.

Of the 5,504 full-time, first-year students in accredited schools of social work in September, 1966, 5,201 returned usable questionnaires. Thus, 94.5 percent of the total potential population was included. In 1960, 93.5 percent of the 2,964 students enrolled in the then existing 63 schools returned usable questionnaires, giving a population of 2,771 for inclusion in the study. The 1966 non-respondents were more or less evenly distributed among all the schools.

In line with the study's objectives, the presentation of the data is organized into the following major areas:

1. Personal, social, and educational characteristics of the students
2. Career choice
3. Choice of social work method concentration
4. Vocational aspirations
5. Financial aid

With respect to the analysis of each specific item included in the study, attention is given to:

1. The general features of the population in relation to the particular variable.
2. A comparison, wherever possible, between the 1960 and 1966 studies.
3. An examination of the relationship between the matter under consideration and two variables which it was postulated would be significant determinants of differences among the students: sex and area of method concentration. Comprehension of the data arising out of material pertaining to gender and method concentration rests upon knowledge that approximately 40 percent of the respondents were men and

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY METHOD CHOICE—1960 AND 1966

Method	1960		1966	
	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	*2771*	*100.0*	*5201*	*100.0*
Casework (CW)	2045	73.8	3193	61.4
Group work (GW)	247	8.9	468	9.0
Community organization (CO)	56	2.0	427	8.2
Combined or other programs*	58	2.1	244	4.7
Generic program	—	—	427	8.2
Undecided	358	12.9	442	8.5
No response	7	.3	—	—

* Excluding those involving community organization

60 percent were women. Moreover, the respondents were divided, according to method concentration, as indicated in the preceding table.[8]

Besides being viewed in terms of the percentage of a particular group which responds positively to an item, the data were also assessed with respect to whether a group was overrepresented in its response in relation to its proportion of the total population; e.g., if 80 percent rather than 60 percent of the individuals responding to an item are females, women are considered to be overrepresented in that category. Virtually all the comments relating to sex differences are discussed in this context as a consequence of the way in which the data were analyzed.

The study incorporates essentially the entire first-year class. Differences are noted among groups within the study and the changes observed between the 1960 and 1966 are reported. No tests of statistical signifiicance are employed in the 1966 study. The determination of a particular finding rests upon the nature of the matter under scrutiny and the extent of the differences found among the groups within the 1966 study itself or between the 1960 and 1966 studies. Differences of over three percent are considered worthy of comment, particularly in light of the observation that such an amount represents over one hundred and fifty respondents, a substantially greater number than were included in 1960 in the community organization and "other method" categories combined (there were ninety-four respondents in these two groups).

[8] It should also be noted that all data pertaining to students who were undecided and in generic and combined or other programs is discussed in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 2

Characteristics of Social Work Students

In personal, socio-economic, and academic characteristics the 1966 first-year social work graduate students closely resemble their 1960 counterparts in many respects. These findings refute to a certain extent the hypothesis formulated at the study's inception concerning the likelihood that the nature of the student population would have been substantially altered over the six-year period due to the influences of events on the national and social work scene. Moreover, in a number of areas the students are very similar to one another regardless of their sex or method. However, definite differences between the 1960 and 1966 populations as well as between men and women and those selecting various methods also appear. Both the important similarities and differences will be highlighted in reporting the data.

SEX OF FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS

It was noted earlier that about 40 percent of the 1966 first-year class were men and 60 percent were women. The proportion of students of each sex entering social work graduate school remained virtually identical during the two years under consideration. (Table 1)

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SEX—1960 AND 1966

Sex	Year %	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Male	40.8	40.8
Female	57.2	59.2
No Response	2.0	—

The failure of a growing proportion of men to enter graduate school in the course of this six-year period is interesting in light of the more favorable public exposure social work had received in the few years prior to the study, particularly with respect to the social worker as an aggressive change agent, administrator, and decision-maker, all roles potentially appealing to men.

METHOD CONCENTRATION

As might be anticipated even from only casual knowledge about the social work field, women predominate in casework, and they constituted the same proportion in 1960 and 1966 (Table 2). Although the absolute numbers increased and men continued to be in the majority in community organization, the actual percentage of men choosing this concentration declined from 1960 to 1966.[1]

TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SEX AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Sex	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Male	36.5	54.4	65.9	36.3	47.0	56.3
Female	61.6	43.4	31.7	63.7	53.0	43.7
No Answer	1.9	2.2	2.4	—	—	—

AGE

About one-half of the 1966 class was twenty-four years of age or less upon beginning social work education and an additional one-fourth was between twenty-five and twenty-nine. On the whole, the 1966 class was somewhat younger than the 1960 group. However, the percentage of students age forty and over remained constant. (Table 3)

TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AGE UPON ENTRY INTO GRADUATE SCHOOL—1960 AND 1966

Age	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
24 or under	44	50
25 to 29	25	23
30 to 39	21	17
40 to 49	8	8
50 or over	2	2

In an effort to determine as precisely as possible the point in the life cycle where professional social work education is begun, the respondents were asked to indicate how old they were upon college graduation and their current age as first-year graduate social work students. From this information the interval between the two events was ascertained.

[1] A description of the findings concerning students who were undecided, had no method concentration or were in a combined method or other program (in teaching practice) is reported in Chapter 7.

Social work students generally received their baccalaureate degrees at the characteristic age for students as a whole in the United States, approximately twenty-two years. More specifically, over two-thirds of the students graduated from college by twenty-two years of age and over three-fourths by their twenty-fourth birthday. (Table 4)

TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AGE AT COLLEGE GRADUATION—1966

Age	% Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
22 or under	69.5
23-24	12.9
25-29	11.2
30-39	4.2
40-49	1.9
50 or over	.3

In 1966, a somewhat greater proportion of students came to graduate school immediately upon college graduation instead of waiting one to three years as did those in the 1960 study. This trend can easily be identified in Table 5.

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY INTERVAL BETWEEN COLLEGE GRADUATION AND GRADUATE SCHOOL ENTRY—1960 AND 1966

Interval in Years	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
less than 1	35.8	43.1
1-3	30.2	23.8
4 or more	33.4	33.1
No response	.6	.6

Women graduate students are more likely than men to have graduated from college at a young age and to have commenced their professional education immediately upon receipt of their bachelor's degree. Simultaneously, however, women also predominate in the older age groups. This bipolarity may be related to the life style of educated women in this country which often involves the pursuit of academic interests either before or during the early years of marriage or deferring them until their families are established.[2] Moreover, men, as subsequent findings in this study reveal, tend to learn about and enter work later than women, often after considering and trying other careers and working a time within social work itself.[3]

---

[2] William J. Reid, "Social Work and Motherhood: Competitors for Womanpower," *Personnel Information*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (January, 1967).

[3] See Chapter 3 of this study.

Method differences with respect to age at college graduation are not noteworthy. Group workers tend to be somewhat younger than those selecting other methods when they enter graduate school. Concomitantly, they are also more likely to seek professional education directly after college graduation. Perhaps the many opportunities available to the undergraduate to explore group work help to enable the prospective group worker to decide on his career and a specialty within it earlier than others coming into the social work profession.[4]

Interestingly, the 1966 caseworkers were younger than those in 1960 and the percentage of community organization students over forty years of age has doubled with an accompanying drop in those between thirty and forty years of age (Table 6). This is a somewhat surprising finding in relation to the hypothesis set forth at the study's inception that the younger "activist" generation would be strongly attracted to community organization and tend to reject the casework method.

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AGE AT GRADUATE SCHOOL ENTRY AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Age	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Under 30	67.2	77.7	73.0	75.0	79.0	74.6
30-40	21.3	16.6	22.0	17.0	14.1	15.7
40 or over	10.8	5.8	5.0	8.0	6.9	9.7
No response	.1	—	—	—	—	—

MARITAL STATUS AND CHILDREN

Table 7 reveals that there were more married students in 1966 than in 1960, although the 1966 students were a younger group. Despite an alleged rising national divorce rate, the percentage of divorced or separated first-year graduate social work students remained about the same. Male students in 1966 as in 1960 were much more likely to be married than women, who were overrepresented in the single, widowed, and divorced populations.

TABLE 7. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS—1960 AND 1966

Marital Status	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
Single	57	53
Married	38	42
Widowed	1	1
Divorced or separated	3	4

[4] See Chapter 3 of this sutdy.

Group workers were more likely to be single than those concentrating in other methods, perhaps in part because they also tended to be younger. Although they were more likely to be younger than the 1960 group, the 1966 casework students had a greater tendency to be married. Among the students in community organization, however, there was a considerably reduced percentage of married individuals over the six-year period, perhaps because there was a substantially increased proportion of women in this method in 1966.

About fifty-five percent of the married students in both years had one or more children. In 1966 the proportion of students who stated they had four or more offspring was double that of 1960. (Table 8)

TABLE 8. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN—1960 AND 1966

Number of Children	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
1	21.9	20
2	19.7	19
3	9.4	9
4 or more	3.2	6
No children or never married	44.1	46.0
No response	1.7	—

RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

There were slightly greater percentages of Jewish and Catholic students and correspondingly fewer Protestants in 1966 than in 1960. In both years about five percent of the respondents indicated no religious affiliation. (Table 9)

TABLE 9. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION—1960 AND 1966

Religious Affiliation	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Catholic	23.3	26.2
Jewish	14.1	16.4
Protestant	55.7	51.5
Other	1.2	1.2
None	5.4	4.7
No response	.3	—

In relation to the total study population, Jewish students were overrepresented among group workers in both years in community organization in 1966. Catholic students were underrepresented in group work, markedly so in 1960. (Table 10)

TABLE 10. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Religious Affiliation	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Catholic	23.7	10.7	24.4	26.7	21.9	22.3
Jewish	13.7	29.4	4.9	17.5	27.4	20.0
Protestant	55.7	51.8	56.1	50.5	44.5	50.5
None or other	6.9	8.1	14.6	5.3	6.2	7.2

RACE

As in 1960, the racial composition of the 1966 first-year class more or less reflected that of the nation as a whole—about ninety percent white and ten percent Black. Thus, social work education in 1966 attracted a greater percentage of Blacks than were in higher education generally, as under five percent were pursuing studies beyond the high school level at that time.[5] (Table 11)

TABLE 11. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY RACE—1960 AND 1966

Race	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Black	11.8	9.3
White	86.3	88.1
Other	1.9	2.6

It is of note that despite social work's efforts to attract Blacks, the proportion in 1966, as shown in Table 11, was smaller than in 1960. In absolute numbers, however, there was an increase in Black students from 1960 to 1966. In 1966, as compared to 1960, there was a decrease in the proportion of Blacks in casework and group work and an increase in the percentage of students selecting community organization. (Table 12) It might be postulated from these observations that if the community organization method continues to grow the proportion of Blacks entering the profession will correspondingly increase.

---

[5] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstracts of the United States: 1967*, 88th Ed. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

[6] Joseph Fichter, S.J., *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges—Class of 1964* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Public Health Service Publication No. 1571, 1967).

TABLE 12. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY RACE AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Race	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Black	11.2	13.6	9.8	9.4	9.9	19.5
White	86.9	83.5	85.3	88.2	88.2	77.4
Other	1.9	2.9	4.9	2.4	1.9	3.1

GEOGRAPHIC ORIGINS

The regional origins of about half of both the 1960 and 1966 student groups were in the Middle Atlantic States. The distribution of students among the other sections of the country remained approximately the same during the two years under study with one exception; in 1966, a somewhat higher proportion of students than previously came from the Far West, probably reflecting national population trends as well as the opening of several new schools in the area. (Table 13)

TABLE 13. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY REGIONAL ORIGINS—1960 AND 1966

Region	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
New England	6.6	6.5
Middle Atlantic	28.0	27.1
Southeast	13.9	12.9
Southwest	3.4	4.5
Central	23.4	22.7
Northwest	4.9	4.9
Far West	6.3	9.3
Canada	8.4	6.9
Puerto Rico	2.0	1.9
Other countries	2.5	3.3
No response	.6	—

In 1966, casework and group work students were somewhat more likely to come from the Middle Atlantic States than was the study population generally, but those in community organization were particularly overrepresented in this category. Group workers came from the Central States in disproportionate numbers with community organization students somewhat less likely to be from this section. There was a substantial reduction in the proportion of community organization students from the Central States and from Puerto Rico with an increase from no students to five percent of those specializing in community organization having their origins in countries other than the United States. (Table 14)

TABLE 14. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY REGIONAL ORIGINS AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Region	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
New England	6.7	7.0	9.8	7.2	5.4	9.9
Middle Atlantic	28.4	33.9	36.6	30.0	30.5	36.9
Southeast	14.0	11.4	7.3	11.6	9.9	8.0
Southwest	3.3	2.9	—	3.9	3.4	2.3
Central	25.4	22.8	26.8	22.9	27.7	20.0
Northwest	4.8	5.5	2.4	5.0	5.8	2.6
Far West	5.4	8.8	7.3	8.4	8.7	10.3
Canada	7.4	5.5	4.9	6.4	6.0	4.7
Puerto Rico	1.4	—	4.9	1.7	—	—
Other Country	2.5	2.2	—	2.9	2.8	5.3
No Response	.7	—	—	—	—	—

As might be anticipated from the nature of social work, graduate social work students represent an urban-oriented group. Only fourteen percent of the 1966 students came from communities of five thousand or less whereas, in the United States as a whole, in 1960—the most recent year for which this information could be secured—approximately thirty percent of the people lived in communities with less than two thousand five hundred people.[7] However, the majority of the respondents by no means came from very large cities or metropolitan areas. Over forty percent had resided in communities with a population under fifty thousand and seventy percent in places with less than five hundred thousand people. (Table 15)

TABLE 15. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SIZE OF HOME COMMUNITY—1966

Size of Community	% Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Village (under 5000)	14.0
Small Town (5000-9999)	9.5
Town (10,000-49,599)	19.7
Small City (50,000-99,999)	10.6
City (100,000-499,999)	16.6
Large City (500,000-2 million)	13.4
Metropolitan City (more than 2 million)	16.2

The questions concerning this matter were phrased differently in the two studies under consideration. First, more precise information was obtained in 1966 but by combining the categories it is possible to compare the data with the more general 1960 findings. Moreover, the 1966 study asked the respondents to indicate the size of their home town during a specific period of time—their high school days—whereas the 1960

[7] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstracts of the U.S.: 1967, op. cit.*

questionnaire simply requested the size of community in which the student spent most of his life. The 1966 respondents appear to have come from somewhat less urban backgrounds than those in 1960. (Table 16) The increase in the proportion of students from such environments may be partially attributed to the opening of new schools of social work in these areas. Moreover, the information explosion, the impact of mass media, and more effective recruitment on the part of the profession perhaps brought people from these areas into social work who might otherwise not have had much opportunity to hear about it.

TABLE 16. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SIZE OF HOME COMMUNITY AND BY METHOD —1960 AND 1966

Size of Community	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*
Under 500,000	63	53	59	70	64	64
Over 500,000	37	46	41	30	36	36
No response	—	1	—	—	—	—

FAMILY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Parents of a greater percentage of 1966 than 1960 respondents were born in the United States. The effects of greatly decreased immigration to this country over the past several decades are reflected in the fact that in 1960 twenty-five percent of the respondents' parents were born outside of the United States whereas in 1966 only twenty percent were. Group work and community organization students were overrepresented in the group that had foreign-born parents, a factor related to their urban origins.

An examination of the socio-economic background of the 1966 students indicated that, for the most part, the fathers of the 1966 respondents were at a somewhat higher occupational level. In particular, there was a greater proportion of fathers in professional positions. (Table 17)

TABLE 17. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS—1960 AND 1966

Occupation	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Professional	19.4	23.7
Proprietor, manager	26.5	24.3
Clerical	13.3	14.6
Farmer	8.2	6.0
Skilled	23.7	22.2
Unskilled	8.3	9.2
No response	.6	—

Both group work and community organization students were more likely to have fathers in professional or business or managerial work and less likely than those in the other method categories to have fathers whose primary employment was as a farmer. Substantially larger percentage of fathers of the 1966 community organization students as compared with those of 1960 are in the professions. Somewhat paradoxically, relatively more fathers of the 1966 community organization respondents also engage in unskilled work. (Table 18)

TABLE 18. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Occupation	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*
Professional	20	22	17	24	26	30
Proprietor, manager	27	28	29	24	26	24
Clerical	14	10	20	14	14	12
Farmer	8	6	7	6	4	3
Skilled	23	22	22	22	21	22
Unskilled	8	11	5	10	9	9
No response	—	1	—	—	—	—

More of the fathers of the 1966 respondents than of the 1960 group went beyond grade school, and a larger proportion had also done graduate work of some sort. The 1966 students' mothers were more likely to have completed high school and college. (Table 19)

TABLE 19. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ACHIEVED BY PARENTS—1960 AND 1966

Educational Level	Father		Mother	
	Year (%)		Year (%)	
	1960	1966	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*
Grade school or less	29	23	22	16
High school attended	17	14	19	14
High school completed	17	19	27	32
College attended	12	13	14	16
College completed	10	12	11	14
Graduate school	12	17	5	7
No response	3	2	2	1

All data pertaining to parental income, another important indicator of socio-economic position, is based upon students who had living parents and who knew the amount the family earned. Accordingly, in both studies approximately one-third of the potential population could not be included.

The figures regarding family income also reflect the higher socio-economic position of first-year social work students in 1966 as compared to

1960 (Table 20). Thus, about half as many students in the 1966 survey as in 1960 reported their parents earned under five thousand dollars per year with almost twice as many 1966 students listing parental annual incomes over five thousand. Although impressive, the increases in family income for the nation's total population have not been as dramatic, as Table 21 illustrates. Despite the more affluent origins of social work students, however, almost twenty percent of these are still from the least advantaged group economically.

TABLE 20. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY FAMILY INCOME—1960 AND 1966

Amount	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
Under $5,000	32	18
$5,000 to $10,000	43	40
$10,000 to $20,00	16	29
Over $20,000	7	13
No response	2	—

TABLE 21. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY FAMILY INCOME COMPARED TO U.S. POPULATION—1966

Amount	Population Groups (%)		
	Social Work Students	U.S. Pop. 1965[8]	U.S. Pop. 1967[9]
TOTAL	*100*	*100*	*100*
Under $5,000	18	33	27
$5,000 to $9,000	40	42	43
$10,000 and over	42	25	30

Students' self-perception concerning social class origins reveal that the vast majority—over seventy-five percent—see themselves as members of the middle class, a finding consonant with the national scene.[10] Of those who did not belong to the middle class, many more respondents identified themselves as being in the lower rather than the upper class. Class differences among the different methods were not especially noteworthy. (Table 22)

As was true for the 1960 students, in 1966 all the measures of socio-economic position showed the women to be at a higher level in this regard than the men. Accordingly, fathers of female students have better jobs, their parents are better educated, and have larger incomes. Women also

[8] *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1967, op. cit.*

[9] Sylvia Porter, "Spending Your Money," *Ladies Home Journal*, Vol. LXXXV, 263 (March, 1968), p. 62.

[10] This question was not included in 1960 study.

TABLE 22. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS—1966

Class	% Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Lower lower	1.3
Middle lower	4.0
Upper lower	8.7
Lower Middle	25.5
Middle middle	34.8
Upper middle	21.1
Lower upper	2.5
Middle upper	1.8
Upper upper	0.3

perceive themselves to be in a higher social strata than do their male counterparts. The findings in this area corroborate those of other studies, particularly Gockel's analysis of college students interested in social work. In fact, his title, *Silk Stockings and Blue Collars*, refers in part to the class discrepancy in the social origins of men and women in the profession.[11]

ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Both the 1960 and 1966 students were educated predominantly and in generally comparable proportions in public universities, private liberal arts colleges, and private universities respectively. The percentage of social work graduate students who came from private educational institutions was considerably greater than the nationwide percentage of individuals enrolled in this type of educational setting. Thus, approximately half of the prospective social workers graduated from private colleges and universities, whereas only around one-third of the total students in higher education were in such institutions in the fall of 1966.[12] (Table 23)

TABLE 23. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION ATTENDED—1960 AND 1966

Type of Institution	Year %	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Private liberal arts	27.7	27.8
Public liberal arts	12.4	10.5
Private university	23.2	20.4
Public university	31.5	32.7
Teachers college	3.0	1.8
Other	2.3	6.8

[11] Galen L. Gockel, *Silk Stockings and Blue Collars* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1966).

[12] *The World Almanac & Book of Facts*, 1968 Centennial Edition (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1967), p. 153.

It was possible to assess the selectivity or quality of the undergraduate schools attended by the 1966 social work students through utilization of material developed for the National Opinion Research Center's survey of career choice in college students, *Great Aspirations,* to which Gockel's previously mentioned study was related. The NORC study utilized a representative sample of all undergraduate students throughout the United States.[13] A comparison of the 1966 study findings with the NORC study data revealed that social work evidently attracts an equivalent proportion of students from highly and moderately selective schools, as in the total undergraduate population. However, a somewhat smaller percentage of social work students came from the average schools, and a somewhat greater proportion of them had attended the least adequate undergraduate institutions. (Table 24)

TABLE 24. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY DEGREE OF SELECTIVITY OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION ATTENDED—1966 SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS AND TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION

Degree of Selectivity	Student Group (%)	
	Undergraduates	Social Work Students
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
Highest	5	6
Moderate	8	8
Average	48	54
Lowest	39	32

Community organization students went in greater proportions to undergraduate institutions with the highest degree of selectivity. Group workers tended to go to somewhat better quality schools than caseworkers. Women are much more likely than men to have graduated from a highly selective institution. (Table 25)

TABLE 25. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SELECTIVITY OF INSTITUTIONS AND BY METHOD—1966

Degree of Selectivity	Method (%)		
	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Highest	5.0	5.6	9.6
Moderate	8.3	9.6	11.7
Average	48.7	49.6	44.1
Lowest	38.0	35.2	34.6

[13] For a more detailed statement concerning the development of the selectivity ratings, see Gockel, *op. cit.*, Appendix I, or James A. Davis, *Great Aspirations* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1964). Personal communication between Dr. Wyatt Jones and Dr. Gockel provided access to the selectivity ratings of all the undergraduate institutions in the United States which were employed in the NORC and Gockel studies.

Only four percent of the 1966 first-year students have degrees beyond the baccalaureate, with the vast majority of these degrees attained at the master's level. In contrast, in 1960 eight percent of the respondents had an advanced degree. While undergraduates, a substantial majority of both groups of first-year students under discussion majored in some division of the social sciences. Next in frequency but far below the social sciences were the humanities, more popular in 1966 than in 1960, and social work, a major more attractive to women than to men. In reference to social work majors, it is important to note that the 1966 students would not have had an opportunity to be influenced to any great extent by the recent growth in undergraduate social work programs. A reduced percentage of the 1966 students concentrated in business while in college. (Table 26)

TABLE 26. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR SUBJECT—1960 AND 1966

Major	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
Social sciences	62	65
Social work	7	8
English and humanities	6	12
Languages	1	2
Arts	1	2
Business	7	2
Education	6	6
Biological sciences	2	2
Physical sciences	1	1
Other	3	—
No major	3	—
No response	1	—

As might be expected from their choices pertaining to major field, social work students usually took many social service courses, at least in some subject areas, in the college years. As was true in 1960, in 1966 almost ninety-five percent of entering students had at least one psychology course and about ninety percent some sociology background. Approximately one-half of the respondents in each year had four or more courses in these fields.

TABLE 27. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY COLLEGE COURSES TAKEN—1960 AND 1966

Field of Study	Year (%)							
	1960				1966			
	No. of Courses				No. of Courses			
	0	1-3	4 or more	Total	0	1-3	4 or more	Total
Psychology	5.2	45.6	48.1	*100.0*	6.4	43.0	50.6	*100.0*
Sociology	11.3	34.1	54.6	*100.0*	11.6	35.9	52.5	*100.0*

Table 27 reveals that there was virtually no change in the attention given these two subjects by the two groups of students under consideration.

However, the 1966 study, which also considered courses in additional social science areas, revealed that about forty percent of the entering first-year class had no political science or economics courses, half of the class had no anthropology background, and sixty percent no courses with social welfare content as the primary focus.

Interestingly, community organization students had taken a somewhat different pattern of social science courses than those in the other methods. They were least likely to have had social work, psychology, or sociology courses and more likely to have taken four or more history, political science, anthropology, and economics courses.

In the two groups studied, a comparison of the grade point averages for the two upperclass undergraduate years indicated that a greater percentage of the 1966 students had grade point averages of B+ or better and a reduced proportion had C+ or below averages. (Table 28)

TABLE 28. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY GRADE POINT AVERAGE FOR UPPERCLASS YEARS—1960 AND 1966

Grade Pt. Average	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100*	*100*
A+ or A	3	5
A-	9	14
B+	21	26
B	28	25
B-	22	18
C+	14	9
C or lower	3	3

Method differences either within the 1966 group itself or between the 1960 and 1966 students are not noteworthy. In 1966 the women coming into social work had obtained significantly better marks in the final two college years than men. In the 1966 study, again due to the work done in the NORC survey previously noted, it was feasible to attempt to equate grades coming from different institutions. In this way, meaningful assessment of the quality of the students' undergraduate work was possible, a recommendation for subsequent research made by Pins in the 1960 study report. The method utilized to achieve the outlined objective was the application of the Academic Performance Index (hereafter to be known as the API), a measure of the relationship between the selectivity of the school attended and the four-year grade point average.[14] The median of the latter for the 1966 social work students was a little under B. Under ten percent were A students.

[14] For further discussion of the construction of the API, see Gockel, *op. cit.*, Appendix 1.

Method differences again seem insignificant and women once again did substantially better than their male counterparts.

The API for social work students as compared to that of the NORC sample of the total undergraduate population indicated that a smaller percentage of perspective social workers as college students generally achieved at a high level but considerably more of the social work students than the others did medium-quality work with concomitantly fewer having done poor work (Table 29).

TABLE 29. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX—COMPARISON OF 1966 SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS AND NORC STUDY UNDERGRADUATES

API	Student Groups (%)	
	Social Work Students	Undergraduates
High	13	19
Medium	50	37
Low	37	44

The information obtained concerning the educational background and accomplishments of social work students would appear to have a number of implications for the planning of graduate social work education. For example, in terms of their formal education, many students appear to have significant gaps in several fields of knowledge—such as government, economics, and anthropology—that are increasingly crucial in social work.

SUMMARY

First-year social work students in 1966 were a young group who tended to undertake graduate professional social work education almost immediately upon college graduation. About three-fifths were women and just over half were Protestant. Ninety percent were white and only ten percent were Black. Most came from urban but not highly metropolitan areas. Social work students are, on the whole, middle class in their backgrounds. The respondents were usually social science majors with average grades. The women generally came from a higher socio-economic level and had better educational backgrounds and attainments than the men. Those concentrating in community organization and, to a lesser degree, group work tended to have more advantageous origins and higher academic achievements.

In general, the 1966 students, when compared to those of 1960, were quite similar in most respects. However, the 1966 respondents were somewhat more likely to be younger, married, from a somewhat smaller community, more middle class in their background, and to have better undergraduate grades.

CHAPTER

3 Career Choice

Why and how did the individuals with the constellation of personal, social, and academic characteristics described in the previous chapter decide to become social workers? Did the presumed recent greater public awareness of social work enable the 1966 students to learn about and make a career choice earlier than the 1960 first-year class? To what extent was the 1966 group influenced by the profession's intensified recruitment efforts and the social consciousness of the nation and, in particuular, of its youth? Is there a relationship between the career choice process and the social work method selected for concentration? This portion of the study report will attempt to provide some of the answers to these and other questions pertaining to the choice of social work as a career. The findings differentiate among *learning* about social work, *considering* it as a career, and *making a decision* to become a social worker.

TIMING OF CAREER CHOICE

The majority of both student groups studied learned about social work at some point after they entered college, with the 1966 students exhibiting a slightly greater tendency to become aware of social work before high school graduation. About one-fourth of each group evidently knew very little about social work prior to the completion of their undergraduate education. Women were more likely to become aware of social work earlier than men. (Table 30)

TABLE 30. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF AWARENESS OF SOCIAL WORK AS A CAREER—1960 AND 1966

Time of awareness	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	9.8	11.0
During last 3 years of high school	16.7	17.6
During first 3 years of college	32.9	29.9
During last year of college	15.6	13.4
After graduation from college	24.4	24.2
Don't remember or no response	.6	3.9

Group workers in both studies had learned about social work considerably earlier than those in other methods. Although in 1966 many more of the community organization students became aware of social work very early in the life cycle, this group still tended to become cognizant of the social work profession relatively late in time. (Table 31)

TABLE 31. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF AWARENESS OF SOCIAL WORK AS A CAREER AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Time of awareness	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	10.0	9.9	2.5	11.6	13.7	11.1
During last 3 years of high school	16.0	22.4	14.7	18.0	23.5	16.5
During first 3 years of college	32.2	30.2	26.8	31.1	30.5	25.5
During last year of college	14.0	15.0	26.8	13.3	11.1	14.2
Post-college	22.9	17.3	26.8	22.9	18.4	26.7
Don't remember or no response	4.9	5.0	2.4	3.1	2.8	6.1

As was the case in relation to *learning* about social work, the 1966 students began to *consider* social work as a potential career for themselves somewhat earlier than did the 1960 group. However, the differences between the two studies are not striking and approximately one-third of each group evidently did not think about becoming social workers prior to college graduation. (Table 32)

TABLE 32. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF CONSIDERATION OF SOCIAL WORK AS A POTENTIAL CAREER—1960 AND 1966

Time of consideration	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	4.0	4.6
During last 3 years of high school	12.0	12.5
During first 3 years of college	27.4	30.7
During last year of college	21.1	18.1
Post-college	35.1	32.9
No response or don't know	.4	1.2

Group work students tended to consider social work as a possible occupation for themselves, as well as to learn about it, earlier than did those who selected other methods. Moreover, the students of 1966 were more likely than those in 1960 to have considered social work earlier, although the percentage of those beginning to entertain the idea of becoming social workers only after college graduation remained constant. The 1966 community organization students seemed to become interested in becoming so-

cial workers much earlier than did the 1960 students in this method. However, they still tended to do so later than those in the two other traditional methods. (Table 33)

TABLE 33. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF CONSIDERATION OF SOCIAL WORK AS POTENTIAL CAREER AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Time of consideration	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	4.1	4.0	2.4	4.8	4.7	5.2
During last 3 years of high school	12.4	14.7	12.2	13.1	17.3	9.4
During first 3 years of college	27.5	29.1	17.1	31.7	33.0	29.6
During last year of college	20.0	24.3	22.0	18.4	18.2	15.1
Post-college	34.2	25.7	46.3	31.0	26.3	39.1
No-response or don't remember	.8	2.2	—	1.0	.4	1.6

With respect to the timing of the actual *decision* to enter social work, there was very little difference between the 1960 and 1966 students. Thus, about one-fourth of both groups did not make a firm commitment to social work until the final undergraduate year and another one-half did so sometime subsequent to their graduation. The women decided upon social work as well as learned about it sooner and began to consider it for themselves earlier than the men. (Table 34)

TABLE 34. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF DECISION TO ENTER SOCIAL WORK—1960 AND 1966

Timing of Decisions	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	.8	1.0
During last 3 years of high school	4.3	4.2
During first 3 years of college	17.8	19.8
During last year of college	25.7	24.3
Post-graduation	50.9	49.8
No response	.3	.9

There was a difference in the timing of the decision to enter social work among those choosing different methods just as method selection was related to variations when students became acquainted with social work and when they began to consider it as a possible occupational area for themselves. Group workers were more likely to choose social work before college graduation, while community organization students were more apt to do so afterward.

In 1966 community organization students had become committed to social work substantially earlier than the comparable 1960 group, as is revealed in Table 35. Nevertheless, in both years community organization

students tended to learn about social work, consider it for themselves, and decide to enter it later in their lives than students selecting the other traditional methods. There were virtually no other changes for the two periods in timing of career choice among the students selecting the two other traditional concentrations.

TABLE 35. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF DECISION TO ENTER SOCIAL WORK AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Timing of Decision	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Prior to last 3 years of high school	.7	2.6	—	1.1	1.1	1.0
During last 3 years of high school	4.4	5.1	4.9	5.0	6.0	1.6
During first 3 years of college	18.3	19.9	12.2	20.4	21.8	20.5
During last year of college	25.2	26.8	19.5	24.3	27.4	23.1
Post-college	49.9	43.8	63.4	48.2	43.7	51.8
No response or don't remember	1.5	1.8	—	1.0	—	2.0

FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER CHOICE

In both the 1960 and 1966 studies, work experience, college courses, and relatives or friends in the field were the major sources from which the respondents learned about social work, although there were some differences in the amount of emphasis placed on these. However, an interesting difference was noted in relation to the type of influences which were important to the two groups of students. In 1966, direct contacts with the field—such as work and experience with people in social work and community activities and, to some extent, recruitment activities—were mentioned more often, with reduced importance attached to such indirect sources as guidance programs of various types, college courses, and the mass media. (Table 36)

TABLE 36. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY MAJOR SOURCES FOR LEARNING ABOUT SOCIAL WORK—1960 AND 1966

Major Sources	Year (%)	
	1960	1969
Work experience	75.7	81.4
College courses and instructors	57.7	53.2
Relative or friend in social work	50.8	52.6
Relative or friend in community activities	20.1	25.0
Fellow students	18.2	20.9
Mass media	22.2	20.7
Social work recruitment activities	16.8	19.0
College guidance	15.2	13.7
Services received	13.2	13.6
Vocational guidance	5.9	5.6
High school guidance	6.0	5.1

Some relationship between method choice and the primary sources of the knowledge about the profession appears to exist. For instance, group work students stressed work experience. This group—and, to an even greater extent, the community organizers—also mentioned relatives or friends in community activities more frequently than did caseworkers.

In 1966, in contrast to 1960, work experience was stressed more by caseworkers, who de-emphasized the influence of college courses. The 1966 group work students were much less impressed by the role of the mass media and high school and college guidance programs in educating them about social work, with social work recruitment activities increasing in importance in this regard. The 1966 community organization students, in contrast with those in 1960, played down the influence of relatives or friends in social work, fellow students, and the mass media in educating them about the profession. To a substantially greater degree than in 1960, they mentioned the influence of work, recruitment activities, and all kinds of guidance programs. (Table 37)

TABLE 37. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY MAJOR SOURCES FOR LEARNING ABOUT SOCIAL WORK AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Major Sources	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
Work experience	76.2	86.0	78.1	82.2	87.4	82.3
College course	60.0	52.6	41.0	55.6	52.8	45.0
Relative or friend in social work	50.6	51.5	65.9	53.3	54.5	50.6
Relative or friend in community activities	22.6	30.5	34.2	23.2	29.5	35.7
Fellow students	18.1	18.4	24.4	21.6	19.0	18.8
Mass media	21.8	25.4	26.9	21.3	17.9	18.6
Social work recruitment activities	16.9	11.8	9.8	20.1	18.2	19.3
Services received from social agency	12.6	19.5	19.5	13.2	16.7	14.5
College guidance	15.1	18.0	9.8	13.7	11.8	13.5
Vocational guidance non-school	5.9	7.7	—	4.7	7.7	8.9
High school guidance	6.3	7.7	—	5.4	4.7	3.3

The students in both studies identified work experience, relatives or friends in social work, and college courses as the most crucial influences in their decisions to enter social work as well as being the major ways in which they were introduced to the field. (Table 38) Once again, all kinds of direct contacts with the field increased in importance in 1966 as critical elements in career choice.

Table 39 reinforces the impression already hinted at in the data previously reported in this study—that students selecting different methods enter social work by somewhat different routes. Thus, caseworkers are more influenced by college courses than those in other methods whereas for group workers, work experience has a greater effect on career choice than

TABLE 38. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER CHOICE—1960 AND 1966

Most important factors	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
Work experience	73.5	81.0
Relative or friend in social work	39.7	44.1
College course	43.2	39.9
Undergraduate social work course	24.2	24.1
College or community organization	23.6	20.7
Relative or friend in community activities	14.2	18.1
Parent or spouse	13.4	15.8
Recruitment	16.5	14.7
Religious leaders	9.3	7.4
Services received	6.4	7.2
Guidance	6.5	5.6

it does for the study population as a whole. Community organization students stress the importance of organization participation and relatives or friends in community activities and were least influenced by recruitment activities and personal contacts in social work.

In 1966, work experience and relatives or friends in social work and community activities assumed greater importance for caseworkers. Group work students in 1966 were more influenced in their career choice by relatives and friends in community activities, and parents and spouses with organization participation were given considerably less credit for bringing them into the field than their 1960 counterparts. Those 1966 students concentrating in community organization stressed work experience, college courses, and contacts with relatives or friends in community activities much more than their 1960 counterparts. However, in comparison to the 1960 students in this method, they downgraded the role of relatives and friends in social work and recruitment in bringing about their career decision.

TABLE 39. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER CHOICE AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Factors in choice	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
Work experience	73.7	84.9	70.7	80.6	87.4	82.1
Relatives or friends in social work	39.6	44.5	46.3	45.2	42.9	36.1
College courses	45.5	32.7	26.8	42.8	34.2	32.6
Undergraduate social work course	25.9	19.5	19.5	25.3	21.4	20.5
College or community organization	21.8	32.0	41.5	18.1	24.1	38.5
Relative or friend in community activities	13.3	13.6	12.2	16.4	19.7	27.0
Parent or spouse	13.4	11.0	14.6	16.1	18.9	14.5
Recruitment	16.3	16.5	14.6	15.1	13.5	10.5
Religious leader	8.5	9.2	7.3	6.9	9.1	7.5
Services received	6.1	9.2	4.9	7.4	7.9	5.1
Guidance	6.4	4.0	4.9	6.6	4.9	5.7

FACTORS BRINGING PEOPLE INTO SOCIAL WORK

In an effort to comprehend more fully the nature of certain of the factors which bring people into social work, some were explored in depth. The factors explored in detail included various forms of work experience and contacts with professionals, organization participation, agencies from which the respondents had received services, recruitment activities, and personal contacts with social workers. The nature of college courses taken by prospective social workers was discussed in Chapter 2.

Pre-professional Work Experience

Opportunities for pre-professional work experience in a number of fields of social work were more often taken advantage of by the 1966 than the 1960 students. Particularly noteworthy was the substantial increase in the percentage of students who had held jobs in the areas of group services, family and child welfare, psychiatric social work, community organization, and corrections. (Table 40)

TABLE 40. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCE IN SPECIFIC FIELDS OF PRACTICE—1960 AND 1966

Field of Practice	Year	
	1960	1966
Group services	35.7	48.4
Public assistance	31.2	32.9
Family and children	28.4	44.2
Psychiatric	18.9	23.2
Medical	12.3	12.5
Community organization	6.4	12.9
Corrections	4.6	12.8
Other	4.8	9.0

As might be anticipated, prior to undertaking graduate education students are very likely to have had pre-professional experience in fields of practice closely related to their method choice once they are in school. For example, seventy percent of the group work students and almost sixty percent of those in community organization had been employed in the area of group services in contrast to about forty percent of casework students. Community organization students are predictably greatly overrepresented in terms of those who have had work experience in the community and report the least amount of employment in the psychiatric field and family and child welfare areas.

Full-time pre-professional experience is most likely to be obtained in public assistance and family and child welfare. Group work and community organization positions not unexpectedly tend to be summer or volunteer jobs.

In 1966, sixty percent of the respondents had full-time jobs in social work at some point prior to entering graduate school, about the same as in 1960. In 1966, less than eight percent had no work experience, while six years earlier about sixteen percent had no work experience. The other statistics in this connection are not comparable because of the different ways in which the data was analyzed. (Table 41)

TABLE 41. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY EXTENT OF PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCE—1966

Extent of experience	Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Full-time	60.2
Part-time	5.6
Summer	13.9
Volunteer	12.8
None	7.5

Group workers and community organization students are underrepresented among those who had full-time positions. Group workers were more likely to have had part-time and summer employment with community organization than students with volunteer jobs. (Table 42)

TABLE 42. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY EXTENT OF PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCE AND BY METHOD—1966

Type of work experience	Method		
	CW	GW	CO
Full-time	61.8	53.2	54.8
Part-time	44.0	13.0	8.1
Summer	14.3	17.2	13.5
Volunteer	12.0	11.5	16.8
None	7.5	5.1	6.8

Between 1960 and 1966 several kinds of government-sponsored programs, such as the Peace Corps and Vista, were developed which, it was theorized, would be attractive to potential social workers or might spark previously uncommitted individuals, an interest in the field. Accordingly, the 1966 study questionnaire asked about involvement in these groups. Five percent of the students had Peace Corps or Vista experience and another eighteen percent participated at some level in Community Action and other Office of Economic Opportunity programs such as Headstart, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Upward Bound, etc. Substantially, the data did not reveal whether students participated in more than one type of program, although the wording of the question permitted more than one response. From the information available it was not possible to determine whether the individuals involved with these programs had a prior interest in social work or might probably never have considered it had they not had such an experience with a program of this nature.

Community organization students were more likely to have participated in all these programs, particularly the Peace Corps and Community Action Programs, than those in other methods. To a lesser extent, group workers were also disproportionately represented with respect to their involvement with these various groups.

In the course of their various pre-professional social work positions or closely related jobs, over seventy-five percent of the students had some relationship with graduate social workers. Another ten percent did not encounter a master's degree social worker and the remainder didn't know if they had or did not have previous social work employment.

Organization Participation

One of the surprises in this study was the finding that the 1966 social work students did not participate in large numbers and intensity in organizations compared to the 1960 class. In fact, the 1966 respondents, who were in large part members of the so-called "activist generation," were slightly less involved than the 1960 group which was just emerging from an alleged silent and apathetic period in terms of organization participation on the part of young people. (Table 43)

TABLE 43. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY EXTENT OF ORGANIZATION PARTICIPATION—1960 AND 1966

Extent of participation	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
None	11.0	14.7
Some	56.3	57.6
Quite active	32.6	27.7
No response	.1	—

Group work and, particularly, community organization students were considerably more active than those in other methods in both studies, a tendency which appears to be tied in with the nature of the social work methods they selected. However, it is intriguing that even the students in these methods were somewhat less involved in 1966 than in 1960. The decrease in their involvement appears to have been even more substantial than occurred for the total population. (Table 44)

The level as well as the amount of participation in organization was less for the 1966 respondents than for those in 1960. The major change noted involved a smaller percentage of students indicating frequent assumption of leadership responsibility and a larger proportion stating they hardly ever undertook such a role. (Table 45)

TABLE 44. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY EXTENT OF ORGANIZATION PARTICIPATION AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Extent of participation	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
None	11.6	7.4	4.9	15.8	11.1	9.1
Some	57.8	45.2	36.6	59.1	54.1	48.1
Quite	30.6	47.4	56.1	25.1	34.8	42.8
No response	—	—	2.4	—	—	—

TABLE 45. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AMOUNT OF LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY—1960 AND 1966

Amount of activity	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Hardly ever	22.3	28.3
Occasionally	48.0	48.6
Frequently	27.3	23.1
No response	2.4	—

Predictably, community organization students followed by group workers reported leadership activity more often than their casework counterparts. However, in line with the trend in the total study population, the amount of such activities was reduced. (Table 46)

TABLE 46. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AMOUNT OF LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Amount of activity	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Hardly ever	23.7	14.7	7.3	31.0	21.0	16.4
Occasionally	49.1	39.0	39.0	48.8	48.5	47.1
Frequently	24.8	44.5	51.2	20.2	30.5	36.5
No response	2.4	1.8	2.5	—	—	—

The 1966 students belonged to the more traditional or conventional organizations, such as religious and student government groups, in considerably greater numbers than other types of associations. However, almost twenty percent identified themselves with civil rights groups. Comparable data are not available for 1960. (Table 47)

Community organization students belonged less to religious groups. These students and, to a lesser but still considerable extent, group workers tend to have been members of civil rights and political groups. (Table 48)

TABLE 47. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BELONGING TO SPECIFIED TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS—1966

Type of organization	Percent of Students
Religious	55.1
Student government	32.0
Other organizations (fraternal groups, parent-teacher associations, etc.)	23.6
Political	22.6
Civil rights	18.9
Labor unions	9.2

TABLE 48. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BELONGING TO SPECIFIED TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS ACCORDING TO METHOD—1966

Types of organization	Method		
	CW	GW	CO
Religious	54.3	54.5	47.3
Student government	30.9	35.5	37.7
Other	22.7	24.6	29.1
Political	20.9	26.7	40.1
Civil rights	16.7	29.7	40.1
Labor unions	8.2	8.8	16.8

As earlier data revealed, approximately fifteen percent belonged to no organizations. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents had joined only one or two kinds of groups. Not surprisingly, community organization students were substantially more likely to have been involved in three or more types of organizations, a situation which was similar, though not to the same degree, for group workers. Thus, about twenty-five percent of the total study population belonged to more than two groups; twenty-six percent of the group workers did so along with thirty-seven percent of the community organization students.

Social Agency Services Received

In 1960 only thirteen percent of the respondents stated that services received from a social worker or social agency were important in introducing them to the profession, and less than half that number felt such an experience was crucial in bringing them into the field. Pins believed that, in order to comprehend the reasons that receipt of social work service did not have very much effect on career choice, it was necessary to find out how many social work students actually were recipients of social services, how often and what kind of services were provided, and whether the students were aware that social workers provided these services. The 1966 study did attempt to secure some of this information, although not in quite as much detail as was suggested in the 1960 study.

Slightly over one-third of the students had received one social welfare service and approximately ten percent two such services. Fifty-three per-

cent were not involved with any social agencies as recipients of service. Group service and medical and psychiatric facilities were the major types of agencies with which the respondents had contact as clients. However, it was not possible to ascertain from the data whether these students were actually assisted by a social worker in the course of their relationship with these agencies nor the quality of such contact when it did exist. Therefore, the reasons why more of those who were involved with these facilities did not perceive them as a significant factor in vocational choice remain elusive.

Substantially more group workers were likely to have received at least one social service. It is because half of the group workers have been recipient of group services that this situation prevails. Otherwise, method differences in relation to type of agency from which services were obtained are unremarkable. From these findings it would seem that group work students would be most likely to be influenced in their career choice by their experience as agency clients or members, but this did not prove to be the case as is seen in the section on factors important in learning about and deciding on social work.

Involvement with recruitment programs

One of the objectives of the 1966 study was the determination of the impact on potential social workers of the profession's recruitment endeavors, which were considerably expanded in the six-year interval under consideration. Accordingly, an attempt was made to find out in some detail the extent and type of recruitment efforts to which the respondents were exposed. Although most of those participating in the 1966 study did not feel recruitment sources were critical elements in their introduction to social work or decision to make it their career, ninety percent of them had had at least one contact with a recruitment activity and half had had three or more. Community organization students were slightly more likely than those in other concentrations not to have had experience with a recruitment activity. Group workers were more prone to have had five or more kinds of contacts.

Perhaps the reason exposure to recruitment activities was perceived to be relatively insignificant in career selection for potential social workers, despite the frequency of contact, is related to the impersonal nature of much of the experience. Books, pamphlets, and newspaper and magazine articles were mentioned most often. Only one-fourth of the students had a summer work experience oriented toward career testing. The failure to recruit effectively at the high school level is also evident from the data obtained in this area. (Table 49)

Group work students were overrepresented with respect to contact with almost all the recruitment activities. Particularly interesting was the substantially greater likelihood that they would have been involved in a career

TABLE 49. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY PARTICIPATION IN RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES—1966

Recruitment activities	Percent of Students
Books on social work careers	53.6
Recruitment pamphlet	50.5
Newspaper or magazine	44.0
TV programs on social work	30.8
Speaker at college	30.5
Career testing summer work experience	23.1
Speaker at organization	20.8
Career conference at college	17.5
TV spot announcement	17.2
Career conference at organization	14.6
Speaker at high school	5.0
Career conference at high school	5.0

testing summer work experience in comparison with those in other specializations.

In addition to inquiring about general kinds of recruitment contacts, the respondents were asked about their experience with established local social work careers programs. Many students thought they had participated in such a program, however, in some cases the city they mentioned did not have a known program. Therefore, when the data was analyzed they were coded as not having been associated with a program of this type.

About ten percent of the respondents received literature through a Social Work Careers Program with slightly less than that percentage having had a personal interview or a summer work experience. In all, about eighteen percent of the total population had had at least one such contact. Women were more apt than men, and group workers more than those in other methods, to have been connected with a recognized careers program.

Relatives in social work

Both the 1960 and 1966 studies inquired about the respondents' relatives who were in social work, with the latter study also asking about close friends in the field, in an effort to determine the extent to which the students could have been influenced in their occupation choice by such relationships. Twenty-two percent of the 1966 students had family members in social work, whereas only thirteen percent of the 1960 students did.[1] In addition, forty-five percent of the 1966 group also had a close friend in social work, with about forty-four percent having neither a relative nor friend in the field. (Table 50) Almost all of the 1966 students who had a tie of this kind indicated it was important in the career choice process, as can be seen in Tables 37 and 38 which appear earlier in this chapter.

[1] Due to differences in the way the data were analyzed in the two studies, other findings with respect to relatives and friends in social work could not be compared.

TABLE 50. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH RELATIVES AND FRIENDS IN SOCIAL WORK—1966

Nature of relationship	Percent of Students
Father	1.5
Mother	3.4
Spouse	3.1
Siblings	3.4
Uncle or aunt	6.6
In-law	3.1
Friend	45.7
Other	1.1

OTHER CAREERS CONSIDERED

While the social work students who entered graduate school in the fall of 1966 were in the process of being influenced by all the previously outlined factors which eventually led them to social work, they were also contemplating other vocational possibilities. The 1960 findings suggest that social work was a second career choice for many, an impression corroborated to some extent by the 1966 data. However, a more careful appraisal in 1966 of the extent to which the students actually pursued other occupational objectives revealed that a great number of them never had been seriously committed to a career possibility other than social work.

For the most part, the 1960 and 1966 data on this subject cannot be compared because different information was obtained in the two studies. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in 1960 teaching and business were most frequently mentioned as other career possibilities, whereas in 1966 teaching, psychology, and sociology were most popular. However, in 1966, with the exception of teaching and business, very few of the students had ever worked in any of the occupational areas listed. Moreover, it is probable that much of the study in sociology and psychology was done at the undergraduate level within the context of a liberal arts education rather than with the intention of pursuing a career in these fields. Thus, the assumption that social work students often really desired to go into other occupational areas and were disappointed in their attempts to do so is called into question. (Table 51)

Group work students were most likely to have been interested in teaching, with community organization overrepresented among those who had considered law, sociology, and the clergy. Students in the latter method were least likely to have thought about teaching or psychology.

In 1960 about eighty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they had considered or tried at least one career, whereas in 1966 about ninety-five percent had done so, although for the most part they had only reached the point of thinking about entering another occupation. In 1960, however, the meaning of "considered another career" was not clarified. The majority of the 1966 group contemplated between one and three other careers. In

TABLE 51. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO CONSIDERED OTHER CAREERS BY EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT IN THEM—1966

Other Careers	Extent of Involvement (%)				
	Considered	Considered and worked	Considered and studied	Worked and studied	None
Business	4.1	6.6	4.9	4.8	79.6
Engineering	1.1	0.3	2.0	0.4	96.2
Law	7.7	0.2	3.2	0.2	88.7
Medicine	6.0	0.5	4.0	0.7	88.8
Nursing	5.0	1.2	0.9	0.7	92.2
Teaching	18.3	7.4	15.4	8.0	50.9
Clergy	4.5	1.4	3.5	2.6	88.0
Psychology	10.0	0.5	31.9	2.5	55.2
Sociology	6.6	0.3	30.5	1.7	60.9
Other	3.5	3.2	8.0	3.2	82.1

both years group work students were most likely to have tried a vocation other than social work but method differences in this connection were much less pronounced in 1966 than in 1960. (Table 52)

TABLE 52. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO CONSIDERED OTHER CAREERS BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Consideration of another career	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Considered or tried another career	84.8	87.6	78.1	94.8	96.1	94.6
Did not consider or try another career	14.2	11.4	21.9	5.2	3.9	5.4
No Response	1.1	—	—	—	—	—

Students in both 1960 and 1966 primarily rejected the other careers which they had considered because they believed they were better suited to social work and felt it was a more important occupation. They stated these convictions to a somewhat greater extent in 1966 than previously and fewer from the 1960 group gave "other reasons" for their failure to go into another field. In 1966, group work and, to some extent, community organization students were more likely than caseworkers to believe social work was more important than the other career possibilities they were considering. Despite the many available pre-professional positions in their area, group workers were least apt to have come into social work because they happened to get a job in the field. (Table 53)

CULMINATION OF THE CAREER CHOICE PROCESS

Potential social workers ultimately dismiss other career possibilities and decide to enter social work primarily because they believe that the profession makes an important contribution to individuals and society, they

TABLE 53. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS REJECTING OTHER CAREERS BY REASONS FOR REJECTION—1960 AND 1966

Reasons for rejection	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Considered self better suited to social work	42.6	46.9
Considered social work more important	13.0	15.2
Tried other career through study or work and did not like it or did not succeed	16.7	14.7
Was offered employment in social work	7.0	6.6
Preparatory study too long	2.7	4.7
Job opportunities, salary, and security poorer	3.4	3.4
Could not finance preparatory study	3.4	3.2
Could not find employment	1.7	1.1
Was not admitted to preparatory study	.5	.9
Other or no response	9.0	3.3

enjoy working with people, and they believe social work is an interesting and exciting occupation. Status and monetary reasons were given little emphasis. Both the 1960 and 1966 studies confirmed this impression, with very little change noted in the area of career motivation over the six-year span.

Despite the similarity in the explanations the 1960 and 1966 students gave for their choice of social work, there was some difference in the pattern into which these reasons fell. More of the 1966 students gave reasons which primarily focused on the altruistic aspects of the profession, on the personal satisfactions they thought it would give them, and on a mixture of material and other rewards.[2] (Table 54)

TABLE 54. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY PATTERN OF REASONS FOR CHOOSING SOCIAL WORK—1960 AND 1966

Pattern of reason	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Altruistic	11.0	17.9
Personal	9.0	11.9
Material	0.8	0.9
Altruistic-personal	59.3	55.9
Altruistic- or personal-material	19.9	13.4

[2] The categories used in this study for classifying reasons for social work career choice are equivalent to the following ones employed by Pins:
Altruistic—both reasons based on social work goals and functions.
Personal—both reasons based on self-assessment.
Material—both reasons based on social work monetary and status renumeration.
Altruistic-personal—one reason based on social work goals and functions and one based on monetary and status renumeration.
Personal-material—one reason based on self-assessment and one based on monetary and status renumeration.

Students in the different methods gave varying patterns of reasons for entering social work in both studies under review. However, over and above the changes noted in this area with respect to the general population, there were some differences in the picture presented by students in the different methods in 1966 as compared to 1960. For instance, group workers and community organizers were more likely to give altruistic-personal reasons in 1966, with the community organization students also giving more emphasis to altruistic motivations by themselves. Relative to the rest of the study population, they also gave exclusively personal reasons more often. None of these students attributed their entry into social work to a combination of altruistic-material reasons, whereas over twenty percent of the community organization students did so in 1960.

For the most part, the attitudes of the majority of significant persons in the lives of potential social workers toward their career choice was favorable in both 1960 and 1966, and only small numbers actually disapproved of the choice. In 1966, teachers and school guidance personnel seem to have been less involved in the decision-making process than they were previously. Interestingly, for unclear reasons, in both years fathers were evidently quite ambivalent about their daughters' choice of social work and mates of female students were less approving than those of the male students.

SUMMARY

From data obtained from both the 1960 and 1966 studies, it appears that social workers come to their chosen career relatively late in their educational cycle, primarily after some direct involvement with it, either through work or personal contacts. Both studies revealed that other types of experiences with the field of social work are not nearly as powerful as these elements, as indicated by the students' general statements concerning the factors which brought them into the profession and a more detailed assessment of the role of some of these elements. Different approaches to their ultimate career choice emerge for students selecting different methods, with group workers probably having the most varied and extensive preprofessional introduction to social work. The 1960 study showed somewhat fewer students who had seriously considered or actually tried a career other than social work.

CHAPTER 4

Method Choice

One of the objectives of this study was a more thorough documentation of students' method concentration than was undertaken in the 1960 study. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether, upon graduate school entry, students are in a position to, and actually really do, make a meaningful choice among the available alternatives. Accordingly, the 1966 study obtained data not asked for in 1960. The data presented in this portion of the study illuminates this subject to a greater degree than in the past and also reflects a growing trend in recent years for students to be permitted or encouraged to delay method choice beyond the beginning of the first year of graduate study. However, the wording of the questions on method choice, which permitted those who had not yet selected a method or stated that they did not have to do so to avoid answering altogether, inhibited the development of as complete a picture as desirable of this topic.

METHOD CHOICE PROCESS

In the years between 1960 and 1966 social work students made considerable shifts in the methods they selected, probably reflecting both changes in their interests and aspirations and the kinds of programs available to them. There was a reduction in the percentage of students choosing casework and, to a lesser extent, in those undecided as to concentration. There also was about an eightfold increase in respondents selecting community organization and a greater percentage identifying themselves as in combined or other programs. Moreover, a considerable body of students, as large a percentage as were in group work, community organization, and the undecided area, stated they were enrolled in a generic course of study, a choice which was evidently not open to the 1960 students but in 1966 was the only option possible for first-year students in a few schools. The percentage of those concentrating in group work remained constant over the period under discussion. (Table 55)

Students in 1966 seem to have chosen their concentrations somewhat later in the whole career and method choice process than did students six years earlier. Thus, about ten percent fewer in 1966 than in 1960 chose their method either before or simultaneously with their decision to become social workers. Instead, they tended to select a method concentration after deciding on social work but before committing themselves to graduate

TABLE 55. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY METHODS SELECTED—1960 AND 1966

Method	Year			
	1960		1966	
	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	*2771*	*100.0*	*5201*	*100.0*
Casework	2045	73.8	3193	61.4
Group work	247	8.9	468	9.0
Community organization	56	2.0	427	8.2
Undecided	358	12.9	442	8.5
Generic	—	—	427	8.2
Combined or other (includes research and administration)	58	2.1	244	4.7
No response	7	.3	—	—

education or at the point of their application to a school of social work. In addition, somewhat more of the 1966 respondents did not settle upon a method at all. It would appear from these findings that, although students in different methods tend to have distinctive characteristics and experiences which bring them into social work, they are for the most part still attracted to the field itself rather than to a component of it. (Table 56)

TABLE 56. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF METHOD CHOICE—1960 AND 1966

Timing	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Before social work	5.8	4.0
At same time as social work	31.1	22.3
After choosing social work but before graduate school	34.4	36.9
At application point	4.4	8.9
After interview	4.3	4.3
Post-admission	4.5	5.2
No method concentration yet or not required	14.1	17.7
Other or no response	1.4	0.8

In 1966, caseworkers more frequently chose their method after deciding on social work. Group workers in 1966 chose considerably later than in 1960 despite extensive pre-professional contact with the field which theoretically might have led them to have specific plans prior to thinking about becoming a part of the field of social work as a whole. To some extent, the above observations also hold true for the community organization respondents, although they were slightly more prone to become involved in social work as an outgrowth of interest in their method rather than the reverse. (Table 57)

At least twenty percent of the first-year class in 1966 had no admissions interview. The respondents who had not yet selected a method did not have to indicate whether or not they had an interview, so it was not possible to determine the total percentage of all the respondents who did or did not have one. Of those who did have an interview and ultimately

TABLE 57. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY TIME OF METHOD CHOICE AND BY METHOD—1960 AND 1966

Timing	Year (%)					
	1960			1966		
	CW	GW	CO	CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Before social work	6.2	9.2	7.3	3.9	5.8	9.3
At same time as social work	35.6	32.5	29.3	28.7	21.0	22.1
After choosing social work but before graduate school	38.8	36.8	31.7	45.7	40.8	39.2
At application point	4.8	4.4	9.8	10.1	14.0	11.2
After interview	4.5	6.3	9.8	4.1	9.3	8.8
Post-admission	4.5	6.6	9.8	5.6	8.0	8.1
Not yet determined	4.5	3.3	—	1.0	0.4	1.0
Other or no response	.8	1.1	2.4	0.9	0.6	0.5

chose a method, somewhat under twenty percent did not discuss method choice at that time. Community organizers and, to a somewhat lesser extent, group workers were substantially more likely to have talked about method concentration at the time of the interview than were caseworkers.

Reasons for Method Choice

The 1966 students decided on a particular method primarily because they felt it best suited their personality and backgrounds and secondarily because they believed the method selected would enable them to carry out the goals of social work more effectively. They attached little importance to other possible motivations. The community organization students were overrepresented among those emphasizing the goals of social work, with caseworkers and group workers stressing the appropriateness of the method for them personally. (Table 58)

TABLE 58. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY REASON FOR METHOD CHOICE—TOTAL POPULATION AND BY METHOD—1966

Reasons	Total population (%)	Method (%)		
		CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Goals of social work	23.0	24.2	30.9	47.4
Personality	52.3	65.8	60.7	45.9
Opportunities	1.3	1.0	2.4	3.8
Financial	1.6	2.1	1.7	0.7
No other method offered	1.9	2.9	0.7	0.3
Only one known	1.1	1.6	0.3	—
Other	1.2	.4	3.3	1.9
Method not yet determined	17.6	—	—	—

About one-half the students felt they had about equal information on all the social work methods at the point they selected their concentration, with approximately one-third stating they knew less about the other

methods than the one they picked. A negligible number indicated complete lack of knowledge about other possibilities. Group workers and community organizers seemed to be more aware of the alternatives than were the caseworkers. (Table 59)

TABLE 59. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS INDICATING AWARENESS OF OTHER METHODS—TOTAL POPULATION AND BY METHOD—1966

Extent of awareness	Total population (%)	Method (%)		
		CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Equally	48.0	50.0	78.9	89.7
Less than others	33.1	47.2	20.5	9.1
Nothing about others	0.8	1.2	0.4	0.5
Not yet determined	18.1	1.6	0.2	0.7

SUMMARY

Several limitations in the study design in the area of method choice necessitates somewhat more tentative conclusions than might otherwise be reached. However, it appears that group workers and community organizers may be more likely than caseworkers to select their method deliberately from among the various possibilities open to them. Thus, they usually had considered their decision with others and had sufficient knowledge about the various specialties to be able to choose among them. There are some indications that caseworkers often entered their method because they did not know very much about the alternatives available to them rather than having arrived at conscious positive decisions to enter this method rather than another.

CHAPTER

5 Post-Graduation Plans

A group of questions in the 1966 study focused on the students' plans and hopes for themselves after receiving the master's degree in social work. This section, which was not in the 1960 study, was incorporated into the current study in order to assess the students' conceptions of their immediate future, the extent to which their plans actually followed the known patterns of previous students, and the import of their intentions for the growing number of opportunities in various types of new programs. Moreover, there was to be some attempt to determine the degree to which students selecting various methods had differing plans and expectations.

EMPLOYMENT PLANS

At the completion of their schooling in June, 1968, over two-thirds of the 1966 first-year class planned to take family and child welfare, psychiatric, or public assistance positions, all relatively traditional areas in social work and those in which the most number of jobs are available and probably utilize primarily the casework method. Slightly under ten percent stated that they would work in the community organization field, which was the fourth most frequent area of choice. This percentage constituted about the same amount as selected the community organization method at the outset of their professional education. Students interested in community development and social action roles would tend to select this area. In this connection, it is interesting to note that a study of the actual employment characteristics of the 1967 graduates showed that under five percent practiced the community organization method. While the rest of the questions of the matter of field of practice in the two pieces of research were not really the same and what a student says upon entering school may be quite different than what he does when leaving, a comparison between these two findings may reflect a beginning student response to new emphases in social work and the nation generally.[1]

Forty percent of the group work students intend to go into traditional group services positions, with a substantial proportion of the remainder planning on jobs in the family and child welfare and psychiatric fields.

[1] Alfred M. Stamm, "1967 Social Work Graduates: Salaries and Characteristics," *Personnel Information*, Vol. II, No. 2 (March, 1968).

For the most part, those in the community organization method plan to enter that field. (Table 60)

TABLE 60. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY FIELD OF PRACTICE FOR ENTRY UPON GRADUATION—1966

Field	Percent of Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Family and child welfare	31.1
Psychiatric	25.6
Public assistance	13.2
Community organization	8.7
Corrections	6.3
School social work	5.6
Group services	4.9
Medical social work	4.6

As might be anticipated, upon graduation most students believe they will be practitioners but at the peak of their career the vast majority believe they will have some other type of responsibility. Although this finding was not surprising, it remains somewhat contradictory since, despite having a more grassroots and supposedly less bureaucratic and status-conscious orientation, today's generation still evidently wants to be part of "the establishment" at some point in the future. (Table 61) Men tend to be more interested than women in administration, with the latter more prepared to be in direct practice even after they have worked a long time.

TABLE 61. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY LEVEL OF PRACTICE UPON GRADUATION AND AT PEAK OF CAREER—1966

Level	At Graduation (%)	At Peak (%)
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Direct	76.3	16.1
Supervision	8.0	10.8
Consultation	2.3	6.9
Administration	3.2	23.1
Teaching	1.1	9.5
Research	1.4	4.9
Undecided	7.7	28.7

The differences among those in the various methods in their plans immediately upon completion of their professional education appear to be related to variations in the kinds of jobs available in the different methods and perhaps to some extent to the age of those selecting the methods. Accordingly, caseworkers and group workers primarily saw themselves as practitioners, whereas community organization students were overrepresented among those mentioning administration. At the height of their professional pursuits, although many students in all methods planned to become administrators eventually, those in community organization were

more likely to want to do so with caseworkers willing to remain in practice jobs.

Whatever type and level of practice the students expected to undertake upon receipt of their degrees, about fifty percent expected to be employed by government agencies, thirteen percent by non-sectarian ones, and another seven percent by sectarian agencies. (Table 62) The study by Stamm noted earlier suggests that at least half of this last group may go into government employment, with the rest about evenly divided between the sectarian and non-sectarian voluntary agencies.[2]

TABLE 62. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AGENCY AUSPICES OF ANTICIPATED FIRST JOB—BY TOTAL POPULATION AND BY METHOD—1966

Agency auspices	Total population (%)	Method (%)		
		CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Federal government	6.8	5.6	5.9	13.6
Local government	42.4	44.3	25.7	26.6
National voluntary non-sectarian	1.3	1.2	1.5	3.3
Local voluntary non-sectarian	12.7	13.6	17.6	15.6
National voluntary sectarian	0.7	0.6	1.5	2.2
Local voluntary sectarian	6.9	6.7	11.5	6.0
Educational institution	4.2	4.6	3.9	2.1
Outside field	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.7
Unsure	24.3	22.7	31.7	28.9

SALARY EXPECTATIONS

Between 1965 and 1967 the median salary for beginning social work graduates rose from $6500 to $7800.[3] The students entering graduate school in 1966, in the middle of this period of time, estimated that their salaries for their first job after graduation would range between $6800 and $7400 (precise median amount was not computed). More of the 1966 students expected to be earning below $6000 than actually proved to be the case for the 1967 graduates. Thus, to some extent the 1966 students were not aware of the increasingly accelerated pace at which salaries for master's level social workers are improving and many must have had a welcome surprise at graduation.

Caseworkers are the least prone to expect high salaries upon graduation. Community organization concentrators in particular and, to a lesser degree, those in group work had the highest aspirations with respect to after-graduation earnings. These findings would seem to reflect the students' awareness of actual conditions in the social work field with respect to pay differentials among those practicing different methods. (Table 63)

[2] Stamm, *ibid.*, p. 51.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

TABLE 63. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SALARY EXPECTATIONS UPON GRADUATION—TOTAL POPULATION AND BY METHOD—1966

Salary (dollars)	Total population (%)	Method (%)		
		CW	GW	CO
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Less than 6,200	21.6	21.6	17.4	14.9
6,200-6,700	13.2	14.0	10.5	10.4
6,800-7,399	25.4	26.6	29.0	18.9
7,400-8,499	27.2	27.3	30.1	31.5
8,500 or above	12.6	10.5	13.0	24.3

SUMMARY

Perhaps the most striking impression gleaned from this segment of the study was that the majority of the students appeared to have a fairly firm sense of direction concerning the development of their career. Moreover, they are willing to commit themselves in this regard. The 1966 students' ideas concerning the future of their careers appear to mirror trends in the field toward more government employment and to some extent toward jobs with a greater social action component.

CHAPTER 6

Financing of Graduate Education

Financial aid is considered vital to the decision of many potential students to actually undertake social work education. Wittman's 1952 study, *Scholarship Aid in Social Work Education,* and Pins' study, *Financial Aid to Social Work,* based largely on data from the 1960 study were benchmark studies.[1] Whenever possible, comparisons are made with the 1960 findings. However, technical and cost limitations did not permit the previous extensive cross-tabulations with biographical and other data done in 1960.

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURES

Over eighty percent of the 1966 students received financial aid; this was about ten percent more than in 1960. In addition, students obtained money to finance their professional education from a variety of sources, as Table 73 illustrates. However, in 1966 almost all sources of funds were mentioned less often than previously. In particular, jobs both within and outside of social work, help from parents or other relatives, and savings did not appear to be as important. (Table 64) Not unexpectedly, women were more apt to receive money from their family and the men to borrow or to have some kind of employment, findings that were in agreement with similar although not comparable data reported by Pins.

Excluding financial aid, the majority of students were receiving assistance from only one other source. Men were overrepresented among those obtaining money from two places and to an even more substantial degree in relation to additional sources of financing. (Table 65)

For those students receiving aid, the amount of the grants has increased substantially in the six-year period under scrutiny, but so did tuition costs. In 1960 over sixty percent of the grants came to under two thousand dollars, whereas in 1966 only about twenty-five percent were in that category. In contrast, over forty percent of the 1966 students were getting

[1] Milton Wittman, *Scholarship Aid in Social Work Education* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1957), and Arnulf M. Pins, *Financial Aid to Social Work Students* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1965). All references to 1960 data in financial assistance were obtained from this study.

TABLE 64. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS UTILIZING SPECIFIED METHODS OF MEETING COST OF EDUCATION—1960 AND 1966

Method	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
Financial aid	70.0	82.3
Personal savings	48.0	42.8
Earnings of spouse	22.0	25.3
Support by parents or relatives	24.0	19.7
Borrowed funds	13.0	12.3
Part-time job outside social work	14.0	7.8
Part-time job in social work	13.0	5.8
GI Bill	5.0	5.1
Other	4.0	1.4

TABLE 65. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS UTILIZING ONE OR MORE SOURCES OF FINANCING—1966

Number of sources	Percent of Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
1	55.6
2	33.4
3	9.2
4	1.7
5 or more	0.1

over three thousand dollars in grants, with only fifteen percent having received this much money in 1960.

Men were more likely than women to be receiving over four thousand dollars, but otherwise the sex distribution in relation to amount of aid was in proportion to that of the population as a whole. It should be noted, however, that women were overrepresented among those receiving no financial aid at all.

Cost of living increases and tuition increases would partially seem to account for the rise in the amounts of the grants. However, the data of other sources from which students received help suggest that higher prices for goods and services did not negate the worth of the increases in what they were getting. Thus, the students appeared to be managing with more funds from grants and less from other sources. (Table 66)

TABLE 66. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID RECEIVED—1960 AND 1966

Amount ($)	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Up to 499	8.0	2.9
500 to 999	12.0	4.8
1000-1999	40.0	19.6
2000-2999	25.0	30.0
3000-3999	8.0	22.4
4000-4999	5.0	8.8
5000 & over	2.0	11.5

Government agencies provided the vast majority of grants for the 1966 first-year students. The proportion of students receiving aid from the federal government increased between 1960 and 1966 and there was a corresponding decrease in the percentage of grants received from voluntary agencies, educational institutions, and foundations. (Table 67) Men were disproportionately represented among those getting help from local government and voluntary agencies. Women, on the other hand, were more apt to receive assistance from the federal government and the schools, perhaps due in part to their better prior academic records and to reluctance to accept assistance involving local employment commitments.

TABLE 67. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY SOURCES OF FINANCIAL AID—1960 AND 1966

Source	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Federal government	20.0	34.5
State or local government	42.0	42.3
National voluntary welfare agency	4.0	3.2
Local voluntary welfare agency	15.0	8.3
School of social work or university	12.0	8.5
Foundation or non-social welfare agency	6.0	2.9
Other or no response	1.0	.2

Although the 1960 and 1966 data on nature of financial aid cannot be compared precisely because the two study populations were asked different questions on this subject,[2] there were some indications that more students were on educational leave with fewer receiving scholarships, fellowships, and loans. In 1966, men were overrepresented among those getting field work stipends and loans and involved in work-study programs, with women somewhat more likely to have been given scholarships and fellowships.

GRANT CONDITIONS

Despite recommendations to the contrary, granting agencies and institutions often require commitments of one kind or another on the part of the individuals receiving financial assistance in an effort to staff and upgrade the agencies or an area or method of practice in which they are interested. In 1966, forty percent of those receiving aid had no field of practice limitations and about seventy percent had no method restrictions. In 1960, fifty-five percent were not subject to either of these types of limitations.

Most students restricted with respect to area of practice were most frequently committed to some aspect of family and child welfare work, psychi-

[2] The 1960 study asked students to indicate nature of aid "as many as apply," while in 1966 the questionnaire asked students to note only "major kinds of aid."

atric social work, or public assistance. (Table 68) Sex differentials were quite marked, with men more likely to have to work in group services, public assistance, community organization, and corrections, and women in medical, school, psychiatric, and family and child welfare settings. Of course, these differences reflect the sex patterns extant in these various practice areas.

TABLE 68. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WITH STIPEND COMMITMENTS BY AREA OF PRACTICE LIMITATIONS—1966

Area of practice	% Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Family and child welfare	30.6
Psychiatric	24.0
Public assistance	21.0
School	6.9
Corrections	6.8
Medical	5.5
Group services	3.2
Community organization	2.0

About one-fifth of the thirty percent committed to a method were confined to casework.

Between 1960 and 1966 there was a slight reduction in the percentage of students who had to work in a specific agency, kind of agency, or location as a condition of accepting their grant—from fifty-seven to fifty-one per cent. (Table 69) Most of those so committed had to work in a particular state or agency, with men overrepresented among those with obligations of this kind.

TABLE 69. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT LIMITATIONS—1966

Nature of employment	% Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Specific community	7.2
Specific state	24.9
Specific agency	15.0
Agency within a group of agencies	2.7
Other	1.1
No limitations	49.1

IMPORTANCE OF FINANCIAL AID TO GRADUATE SCHOOL ENTRY

Between 1960 and 1966 there was relatively little change in the importance attached by students to financial aid with respect to making professional social work education possible. Thus, about fifty percent of the students in the years sampled stated that without aid they would have been

unable to attend and about another twenty-five percent stated they could have done so only under conditions of extreme hardship. (Table 70) Both the 1960 and 1966 findings indicated that women could have most easily managed without help and men would be most likely to have had some or a good deal of difficulty. However, in relation to their numbers in the total population, an equivalent proportion of both men and women would not have come to school.

TABLE 70. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS BY INDICATION OF DIFFICULTY IN ATTENDING GRADUATE SCHOOL WITHOUT FINANCIAL AID—1960 AND 1966

Degree of Difficulty	Year (%)	
	1960	1966
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*
Managed without difficulty	3.0	4.5
Managed with some difficulty	19.0	20.8
Managed but under extreme hardship	23.0	22.8
Unable to attend	55.0	51.9

In an attempt to assess the importance of available funds in the decision of recent undergraduates to go to graduate school, the 1966 study participants were asked the reasons for their failure to begin their professional education upon college graduation in the event they had not done so. A little over fifty percent chose to do something else than undertake social work education at that time. Twelve percent of the total respondents gave lack of finances as their reason for not going to school. The other thirty-eight percent who pursued other activities emphasized problems around career choice, the desire for work experience prior to graduate school, and their desire to get away from formal schooling for awhile. Accordingly, it would seem that future attempts to recruit undergraduates with similar predilections through additional financial inducements might not be overly productive. (Table 71)

TABLE 71. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO REASON FOR NOT ATTENDING GRADUATE SCHOOL IMMEDIATELY UPON COLLEGE GRADUATION—1966

Reasons	Percent of Students
TOTAL	*100.0*
Wanted work experience prior to school	16.0
Undecided about career	13.5
Financially unable to attend	12.8
Unwilling to undertake graduate work at that time	7.1
Not accepted	1.7
Other	0.9
Went to School	48.0

SUMMARY

Financial aid has been and evidently remains a major factor in maintaining the enrollments of graduate schools of social work. Students are becoming increasingly dependent on various kinds of assistance, with a greater percentage of students at the first-year level receiving financial aid and larger amounts being provided, with concommitantly less financing from other sources. Men are evidently more in need of help and most likely to receive it. Commitments of one sort or another are still very much part of the financial aid picture, and students, however reluctantly, are willing to undertake them in order to come to school. However, the availability of money does not seem to be the only major factor in capitalizing on an individual's interest in social work to the point where he decides to attend graduate school. Many individuals express a desire to explore the field in some depth before doing so, emphasizing the importance of the availability of worthwhile pre-professional work opportunities. Nevertheless, the possibility of having adequate funds to undertake their education would seem to be the decisive factor for many students who return positive answers to their letters of acceptance to graduate school.

CHAPTER 7

The No Concentration, Undecided, and Other Method Students

The 1966 study obtained data on a new group of students which did not exist to any large degree six years earlier. Approximately 20 percent of the 1966 respondents stated they were involved in generic sequences, were undecided regarding method concentration, or were in other types of programs.[1] The percentage of the total sample in these three categories was slightly larger—four percentage points—than the percentage in both group work and community organization.

The generic or no concentration group, about eight percent of the sample for the most part, consisted of students in schools which offered only programs of this type for the first-year class—e.g., San Diego State College School of Social Work. The undecided group, again eight percent of the study's participants, also included students from schools with generic sequences as well as those from other schools who had not yet made up their minds concerning this matter and were not required to do so until later in the school year. However, it should be noted that some of these undecided students attended institutions which only offered one method concentration and, therefore, they really had no choice. Accordingly, the accuracy of the response to this particular question is in some doubt. About five percent of the respondents indicated they were in combined or other programs. They were concentrating in research, administration, casework and group work, or some combination of these possibilities.

The other responses of students in these three categories—no concentration, undecided, and other—often revealed somewhat different patterns of individual characteristics and career and method choice than those of students in each of the traditional methods. In some respects these students resembled respondents in one rather than another of the usual areas of concentration.

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

There were somewhat more men in the no concentration and undecided categories than in the casework sequence, 44 percent compared with 36

[1] See Chapter I and Chapter IV for tables concerning areas of method concentration.

percent. The combined or other programs and community organization had the greatest percentage of men, about 50 percent, a finding probably related to the tendency for men rather than women to be interested in administration and research.

The students in combined programs were older than those in other categories when they graduated college and entered graduate school. The other method respondents were also more likely to have had a longer interval between college graduation and graduate school entry than those in any other category. For the five percent of the respondents in the combined or other programs, these data concerning age again reflected the students specializing in administration and research, areas which people are evidently able to work in or at least enter without graduate social work education. (Table 72) Their tendency to be older also possibly accounts for the finding that the no concentration and combined or other method respondents were more apt to be married, with the latter group also more likely to have been divorced.

TABLE 72. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN OTHER METHODS BY AGE AT GRADUATE SCHOOL ENTRY—1966

Age	Method (%)		
	No Concentrattion	Undecided	Combined or Other
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
24 or under	43.5	51.0	39.7
25 to 29	25.3	22.0	21.0
30 to 39	18.7	16.1	21.3
40 to 49	9.5	9.1	13.5
50 or over	3.0	1.8	4.5

The religious origins of the respondents in the three categories under consideration were somewhat different than those of the other students. Particularly striking was the decrease in the percentage of Jewish students in all these groups. Moreover, no concentration students had the highest percentage of Catholics, with the combined or other method category having the lowest percentage of students of this faith and concommitantly the greatest proportion of Protestants. (Table 73)

TABLE 73. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN OTHER METHODS BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Religious Affiliation	Method (%)		
	No Concentration	Undecided	Combined or Other
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
Catholic	32.1	27.9	19.5
Jewish	7.5	7.9	7.8
Protestant	54.2	56.2	65.7
None or other	6.2	8.0	7.0

The racial origins of these three groups were also different than those of the other categories. Whites constituted the overwhelming majority of these students (95 percent in no concentration and 90 percent in the other two

categories), while Blacks were represented by only slightly over 2 percent in no concentration and nearly 7 percent in the other categories. Other ethnic groups were represented by approximately 3 percent in no concentration, and nearly 4 percent in the undecided and combined or other method categories.

When compared with the traditional methods group, the no concentration, undecided, and combined or other method students came from the Southeast, Southwest, and Far Western parts of the country in greater proportions. In addition, their geographical roots were more likely than those of the other students to have been suburban and rural than urban. These findings were at least partially related to the policies of some of the schools in these areas concerning method concentration. For instance, several of the Far West schools only have a generic curriculum the first year.

The data concerning regional origins and size of community would also seem to have a relationship to the finding that the undecided and no concentration students—particularly the latter—are the least likely of all the respondents to have foreign-born parents. In other words, immigrants tend to be found in the urbanized northern industrial sections of the nation. Also, due to the geographical origins of the students from the other method categories, a greater ratio of fathers were farmers than was the case for the other groups of students. Students in the other methods were overrepresented among the respondents whose parents had the least formal education.

With respect to their academic credentials, the students who had no concentration, were undecided, or were in combined or other programs did their undergraduate work in institutions with the lowest degree of selectivity based on the ratings employed in this study. Thus, while approximately 39 percent of all respondents attended the poorest quality schools, 44 percent of the students in the categories under discussion did so.

The no concentration and combined or other program respondents did not major in the social sciences as often as the whole study group, with the other program students, however, more likely to have been business majors while in college. The no concentration group had somewhat less social science preparation than the remainder of the students.

The academic performance index for the students under scrutiny in this chapter suggested that the quality of their undergraduate work may not have been quite as high as that of the other respondents. Fewer of these students had a high API and a greater percentage a low one. (Table 74)

TABLE 74. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN OTHER METHODS BY API—1966

API	Method (%)		
	No Concentration	Undecided	Combined or Other
TOTAL	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*
High	8.7	8.2	10.9
Medium	52.1	54.3	45.8
Low	39.2	37.5	43.3

CAREER CHOICE

The study participants classified as having no method concentration, undecided, or in combined or other prorgams tended to learn about social work and consider it as a potential career relatively late in time compared to the other students. The profile of the three groups under consideration in these areas most clearly parallels that of the community organization students.[2]

These students, on the whole, did not consider work experience or recruitment activities as influential in introducing them to social work as did those individuals in the traditional methods. The no concentration category also de-emphasized college courses and college guidance and placed greater stress on the role of the mass media. The combined and other program students did not think college courses and college guidance, relatives or friends in social work, fellow students, or mass media were as significant elements in their learning about social work as did the rest of the study population.

The no concentration students emphasized organization participation as an important factor influencing their career choice to a greater extent than did the casework, undecided, and combined or other method students. The latter respondent group emphasized the significance of relatives or friends in community activities and, to a slight extent, services received in this connection. They underplayed the influence of involvement in organizations. With respect to the kinds of work experience which affected their career choice, combined and other method students were more likely than the others to have had jobs in public assistance and corrections. The combined and other method students were also most likely to have had full-time employment, reflecting the facts that they tended to be older and have had a longer interval between college and graduate school than the students in other methods. The undecided students, along with the community organization ones, tended to have had volunteer jobs prior to entering graduate school. Contacts with graduate social workers during their professional work experience was least likely to have occurred for those in the no concentration and undecided categories.

The students in the three groups considered in this chapter belonged to and were active in organizations to about the same extent as casework students; however, they tended to join different types of organizations. For instance, the undecided and no concentration groups were more likely to have been members of religious organizations and the generic program respondents were underrepresented among those active in civil rights groups.

Those in the combined or other method category were least likely to have received services from a social welfare agency. The no concentration students and, to some extent, the undecided and combined or other method groups did not receive service so frequently. Consequently, the formulation

---

[2] Computer error prevents the presentation of the data concerning the timing of the decision to enter social work for the group being discussed in this chapter.

of the picture concerning their knowledge about the various social work methods and the reasons they did not select one of them was severely restricted. The study also failed to ask about their method choice for the second year of graduate study.

POST-GRADUATE PLANS

The post-graduation plans of the no concentration and undecided students more or less reflected those of the caseworkers. The combined or other methods students were substantially overrepresented among those who will work in public assistance programs and will assume supervisory and research responsibilities. The undecided and no concentration students were least sure of the level of practice in which they wished to function. For the most part, these interests were reflected in their plans for themselves at the height of their professional pursuits as well as right after receiving their degree.

The undecided and no concentration students (along with the casework students) were least prone to have high salary expectations for their first job. In contrast, the combined or other program group had relatively high aspirations in this regard, reflecting the type of responsibilities they planned to undertake.

SUMMARY

The no concentration, undecided, and combined or other method respondents were more likely than those in the traditional methods to be Protestant and white and have their origins in the smaller communities of the South, Southwest and Far West of the country. The students in the three categories under consideration are also overrepresented among the students who came from the least selective undergraduate institutions and did the poorest quality academic work. With regard to the career and method choice process, there were indications that the no concentration and undecided students had the least extensive pre-professional exposure to social work and its component parts. The gap in their knowledge about social work created by this situation perhaps was a factor for some in their failure to select a method upon graduate school entry. Others definitely wanted a generic program or had no choice concerning this matter.

In viewing the data pertaining to the significant percentage of students who had no method or were undecided, one is stimulated to speculate concerning the eventual work these students will undertake. Their backgrounds, interests, and responses to questions about post-graduation plans plus the nature of the social work field itself indicate that they will do casework predominantly, but this line of inquiry certainly needs to be pursued further.

CHAPTER 8

General Summary of Findings

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

Profile of First-Year Students in 1966

Approximately two-fifths of the first-year students entering schools of social work in 1966 were men and three-fifths were women. About one-half of the students were under 25 years of age when beginning their graduate social work education. Almost half of the students were or had been married. Slightly more than half of the students were Protestant, about one-fourth Catholic, about 16 percent were Jewish. (Six percent indicated "other" or "no response.") Approximately one-tenth of all students were Black (88 percent were white and three percent were "other"). Most students came from large communities, almost one-third from cities with populations over a half-million. The socio-economic background of students' parents was lower middle and middle class. The annual income of half the parents was less than $10,000. The social sciences was the undergraduate major of approximately two-thirds of the students; less than one-tenth reported an undergraduate social welfare major. The undergraduate grade point average of three-fourths of the first-year graduate social work students was "B" or better; one-fifth reported an A or A⁻ average. Over one-tenth of the social work students came from colleges and universities with the highest degree of selectivity.

Changes Since 1960

There was little or no change (less than five percentage points) between first-year students entering schools of social work in 1960 and 1966 in the following characteristics: sex, religious identification, race, and undergraduate major.

In 1966 more of the entering social work students were under 24 years of age than in 1960. Even though younger, a greater proportion of the students in 1966 were married than were those six years earlier. A smaller percentage of the 1966 student study population came from large metropolitan cities than was the case in 1960. Compared to the 1960 population, as a group, the 1966 students came from a somewhat higher socio-economic group and had a higher undergraduate grade average.

Differences Among Students Concentrating in Various Methods

In 1966 there were no or only few differences in the following areas among first-year students concentrating in the casework, community organization, and group work methods: age, socio-economic background, and undergraduate grade point average. However, the proportion of community organization students with undergraduate education from colleges and universities with the highest degree of selectivity was almost double that of casework and group work students.

Most of the students in community organization were men; more than half of the students in group work and only about one-third of the casework students were male. The percentage of married students was less among those concentrating in group work than in the other two methods. The proportion of Jewish students in group work was substantially higher than their representation in the total student body, while the percentage of Protestant students in group work was less than their proportion in the other two methods. Almost 20 percent of all students in community organization were Black; this is twice as high as their representation in either of the other two methods. More of the group work and community organization students came from large metropolitan areas than did casework students. Students concentrating their studies in community organization had undergraduate majors in humanities and languages more frequently than the total social work student body.

Between 1960 and 1966 there were a few major changes. The proportion of female students in group work and community organization has gone up. There has been an increase in the percentage of casework students under 30 years of age. The proportion of group work students who were Catholic has doubled and the percentage of Jewish students in community organization has quadrupled. The percentage of black students in community organization has doubled while their proportional representation in the total student group and in casework and group work has declined slightly.

CAREER CHOICE TIMING FACTORS AND VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

First-Year Students in 1966

Approximately three-fourths of all first-year students in 1966 first learned of social work as a career only after they completed secondary education; one-fourth did not do so until after college graduation. For the students studied, the three major sources of information about social work were: work experience, college courses and instructors, and relatives or friends in social work. The same three items were also the key factors influencing the choice of social work as a career.

Many students had contact with social work recruitment media and ac-

tivities. Over half of the students reported seeing books and recruitment pamphlets on social work careers; one-third saw TV programs or heard speakers at college. Almost one-fourth of the students had career-testing summer work experiences. Few reported recruitment contacts at the high school level. Approximately three-fifths of all social work students had full-time work experience in social welfare prior to entry into graduate professional education. Another one-fifth of the students reported part-time or summer paid employment in the field. Almost one-fifth of the students participated in some level of community action and other OEO programs. Five percent of the students were graduates of VISTA and Peace Corps. About 85 percent of the students were active in various organizations. Over half of these students reported belonging to religious groups, one-third to student government groups, one-fourth to political groups, one-fifth to civil rights groups, and one-tenth to labor unions. Over three-fourths have held leadership roles.

Almost half of the students had a friend in social work and over one-fifth a close relative. Over 90 percent of the students reported that they had considered or tried another career before selecting social work; teaching and psychology were most frequently mentioned. The students reported that they entered social work because they believe the profession makes an important contribution to individuals and society and because they enjoy working with people.

Over two-thirds of the first-year students plan to take positions in family and child welfare, psychiatric, and public assistance settings. Somewhat less than one-tenth plan to enter employment in community organization. Over three-fourths of the students plan to take direct service jobs, but only 16 percent plan to hold these at the peak of their careers. Administration is the long-range career goal of one-fourth of the students and, at the peak of their career, one-tenth of the students hope to be in supervision and a similar proportion in social work education.

Changes Since 1960

There were no major changes between the first-year students in 1960 and 1966 in the following areas: the timing of awareness of social work as a career and of deciding to become a social worker, the major sources of information about social work, the key factors influencing the choice of a social work career, and the degree of organizational activity and leadership.

While the proportion of 1960 and 1966 students who had full-time work experience in social work prior to graduate education was similar, the percentage having part-time and summer work experience in 1960 was more than twice as large. Another major difference between the two groups of students was the fact that the proportion of first-year students in 1966 who had social workers among their relatives was twice as large as the student body six years earlier. Data from 1960 were not available to compare the nature of recruitment contacts, the nature of work experience in anti-

poverty programs, the kinds of organizational affiliations, or vocational short- and long-range aspirations.

Differences Among Students in Concentrating in Various Methods

Where data were available, major differences were found among casework, community organization, and group work students in 1960 and 1966. Only in the timing of the final career decision were they similar.

A greater proportion of group work students became aware of social work as a career prior to graduation from high school than was true for the other two groups of students. Students concentrating their studies in community organization learned about social work less from work experience and college courses and more from relatives and friends in community activities than did casework and group work students. Community organization students compared to other students were more influenced to choose social work by college and community organization activity and by relatives and friends active in community activities and less influenced by relatives and friends in social work; they also listed altruistic reasons for the key factor in selecting a social work career. Casework students had substantially more full-time and part-time work experience in social work prior to graduate professional education than did students concentrating in the other two methods. Both group work and community organization students were more active in organization activity than casework students. As a group, students in community organization were more involved in political, civil rights, and labor unions than other students. A larger proportion of casework and group work students considered or tried another career before social work than did community organization students. The proportion of community organization students planning immediate employment or long-range careers in administration was higher than for the other two groups of students.

There were also many changes between 1960 and 1966 among the three groups of students. For example: in 1966 a larger proportion of community organization students reported learning about social work while in high school, a smaller proportion made their final decisions after college graduation. A much higher percentage of community organization students learned about social work from relatives and friends in the field and were influenced in their career choice by work experience; and a smaller proportion of group work students were influenced by participation in college and community organizations.

CHOICE OF A SOCIAL WORK METHOD FOR CONCENTRATION

The 1966 study obtained more definitive and detailed data than previously available on the timing, process, and reasons of student selection of a social work method for concentration.

Key Findings about 1966 First-Year Student Group

Slightly over 60 percent of all first-year students in 1966 selected casework as their method for concentration; nine percent chose group work, and eight percent community organization. Five percent were enrolled in programs offering studies in integrated or combined methods, and 17 percent of the students reported that they had not yet selected a concentration or did not respond to this question. Approximately one-fourth of the students chose the social work method concentration prior to or at the same time as deciding on social work as a career.

Almost three-fifths of the students report having discussed their method choice during the admission interview. Many students also discussed their method choice with "significant others." More than half discussed it with social workers, two-fifths spoke with friends and relatives. About one-third of the students studied discussed their choice of a social work method with school faculty and a similar proportion spoke with fellow students.

Over half of the students decided on a particular social work method for concentration because they felt it best suited their personality; one-fourth believed the method choice would best enable them to carry out the goals of social work. Almost 50 percent of the students reported that they had equal information about all the methods of social work at the time they selected their concentration, with approximately one-third noting that they knew less about the other methods than the one they picked.

Changes Since 1960

In the years between 1960 and 1966 there was a considerable change in the distribution of first-year students in schools of social work among the methods of social work and other means used by schools to organize the teaching of social work practice. There was a substantial decrease in the proportion of students concentrating their studies in casework and a major increase in those in community organization. The percentage of students in studies of combined or integrated methods, although still less than five percent, tripled and the proportion of students who had not yet chosen or been required to select a method for concentration had grown.

The proportion of students who made a method selection prior to and concurrent with the choice of a social work career declined between 1960 and 1966.

Differences Among Casework, Community Organization, and Group Work Students

There were significant differences among the three groups of students in the timing of their choice of a concentration, those who helped with the de-

cision, their awareness of other methods at the time of their decision, and the factors influencing their choice.

The proportion of casework and group work students who made a method selection prior to or concurrent with their choice of social work as a career was greater than for community organization students. Almost one-fifth of all casework students did not discuss their method concentration during their admission interview; the percentage of community organization students who did discuss it was greater than for casework and group work students. Community organization students, as a group, also discussed their method selection more than others with friends and relatives, other social workers, social work faculty, and fellow students. About two-thirds of the casework students reported that they were most influenced in their method selection by their personality; group work students were influenced somewhat less by this factor and less than half of the community organization students listed it as the key factor. The proportion of community organization students listing their belief that the method of their choice best achieves the goals of social work was twice as high as was true for casework students and 50 percent higher than listed by students concentrating their studies in the group work method.

Almost half of the casework students reported that they knew less about group work and community organization than the method of their choice. On the other hand, only one-fifth of the group work students and one-tenth of the students in community organization reported knowing less about the other two methods than the one they selected for concentration.

FINANCIAL AID

General Findings about 1966 First-Year Students

Over three-fourths of all first-year social work students in 1966 received financial aid for their education. In addition, about two-fifths used personal savings, one-fourth had the support of a spouse's earnings, and one-fifth received financial support from parents and relatives. Somewhat over one-tenth of the students used income from part-time employment to support the cost of their education and a similar percentage borrowed funds for this purpose.

The amounts of financial aid received varied greatly. The amount of grants for three-fifths of all students receiving aid ranged between $2,000 and $5,000. One-fifth of the students received grants between $1,000 and $2,000 and less than one-tenth had financial aid amounting to less than $1,000. Slightly over one-tenth of the students had grants of $5,000 or more. About one-third of the grants were from the federal government and two-fifths from state and local government sources. In total, public agencies accounted for three-fourths of all grants, slightly more than one-tenth of all

grants were provided by national and local voluntary agencies, and less than one-tenth came from university or school of social work funds.

Over half of all financial aid grants were in the form of fellowships and scholarships. One-fourth of the students had educational leaves, about one-tenth received field work stipends, and an almost similar percentage were involved in work-study plans. Many of the financial aid programs included post-education commitments. Three-fifths of the grants limited the student to a particular field of practice for employment, and about one-fourth had restrictions related to a social work method. About half of all students receiving aid also had to commit themselves to accept employment in a specific geographic area, agency, or group of agencies. Over half of the students reported that without financial aid they would not have been able to attend a graduate school of social work and another one-fourth said they would have managed but with extreme hardship.

Changes Since 1960

There was no major change between 1960 and 1966 in the nature of financial aid, although there was a small increase in the percentage of students on education leave. There also was no change in the six years in the proportion of students reporting that they would have been unable to attend a school of social work without financial aid or without major hardship.

The proportion of first-year students receiving financial aid rose from 70 percent in 1960 to 82 percent in 1966. The percentage of students using other sources of support remained largely unchanged except that there was a decline in the proportion of students using personal savings and income from part-time employment and obtaining support from parents. The amounts of financial aid received by students increased during the years under study. For example, in 1960 three-fifths of all students received grants under $2,000 while in 1966 less than one-fourth received aid in such amounts; over 40 percent of all students in 1966 received grants amounting to $3,000 and more, while in 1960 only 15 percent had such support. The proportion of grants from the federal government increased while support from local voluntary agencies and university sources declined. There was also an increase in the number of grants with limitations to a field of practice and/or social work method and a small decrease in those requiring the student to accept employment in a particular agency or geographic area.

Appendix -

Student Questionnaire—1966

Council on Social Work Education 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.10017

#66-111-1

STUDY OF FACTORS AFFECTING CAREER AND METHOD CHOICES OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS

Student Questionnaire

All first year, full-time students who are enrolled in schools of social work in the United States and Canada on September 1, 1966 or who will begin their first year, full-time studies shortly thereafter are being asked to complete this questionnaire. This study will seek to determine the factors which influence individuals to choose social work as their career and to select a particular social work method for concentration. The Council on Social Work Education is conducting this study in cooperation with all the schools of social work in the United States and Canada. The conclusions drawn from this study will enable the Council on Social Work Education and the National Commission for Social Work Careers (jointly sponsored by CSWE and NASW) to obtain valuable information urgently needed to plan effective recruitment and educational programs for the future.

Instructions to the Student

This questionnaire will take you less than thirty minutes to complete. Your responses are anonymous and confidential. Your individual identity will not be known.

This questionnaire is not a "test". There is no "grade" or other mark. The only "right" answers to questions are those which best explain your situation or express your views. Since the questionnaire is designed to obtain an overall picture, some of the answers to be checked may not always express the subtleties of your opinions. Answer each question as carefully, as completely and as frankly as possible.

To complete this questionnaire:

1. *Please answer all questions, except where directions instruct you to skip to another question. Note that all instructions appear in capital letters. Some questions require a single answer and you are instructed to "CHECK ONLY ONE". Other questions instruct you to "CHECK ALL THAT APPLY".*

2. *Please place a bold check mark ☑ in the box appearing to the right of each answer which applies best to your situation. Where fill ins are specified, please print your answer legibly.*

3. *Please fill in the Response Card inserted at the end of the questionnaire. Hand in the card separately from your completed questionnaire. The card will be used only by your school to check that each student has turned in a questionnaire.*

4. *Please fill in the name of your school and the date below.*

Name of School	*Date*

1-3/

3-4-5/

Your participation is essential to the success of the study. Thank you for your cooperation.

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

CHECK YES OR NO

1. Are you a full time student? . . . . . Yes ☐ No ☐ 6/1 2

2. Are you a first year student? . . . . . Yes ☐ No ☐ 7/1 2

3. Are you a student from abroad planning to return to your native country . . . . . Yes ☐ No ☐ 8/1 2

4. What were the major sources from which you learned about SOCIAL work?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY UP TO SIX ITEMS

Service received from social worker or social work agency	☐	9/1 2
Direct work experience in social work or closely related activities (paid or volunteer).	☐	10/1 2
College courses or instructors	☐	11/1 2
College guidance department or staff	☐	12/1 2
High school guidance program	☐	13/1 2
Non-school connected vocational guidance	☐	14/1 2
Relative, friend or acquaintance who is a social worker.	☐	15/1 2
Relative, friend or acquaintance who is active in community and welfare activities.	☐	16/1 2
Fellow students in college	☐	17/1 2
Movie, radio, TV, books, newspapers or magazines	☐	18/1 2
Social work recruitment program, speaker or literature	☐	19/1 2
Other (specify) _____	☐	20/1 2

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

5. In your decision to make social work your career, which of the following were the three most important factors?

CHECK ONLY THREE ITEMS

Parent, husband or wife	☐	21/1 2
Minister, Priest, Rabbi or other religious leader	☐	22/1 2
Participation in college and community organization	☐	23/1 2
Social work recruitment program, speaker or literature	☐	24/1 2
School or community guidance program	☐	25/1 2
College courses or instructors	☐	26/1 2
Undergraduate course in social work or social welfare	☐	27/1 2
Direct work or volunteer experiences in social work or closely related activities	☐	28/1 2
Service received from social worker or social work agency	☐	29/1 2
Relative, friend or acquaintance who is a social worker	☐	30/1 2
Relative, friend or acquaintance who is active in community and welfare activities	☐	31/1 2

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

6. With which of the following have you had any contact? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Social work recruitment pamphlet or flyer	☐	32/1 2
Books on social work careers	☐	33/1 2
TV program dealing directly and primarily with social work	☐	34/1 2
TV spot announcement on social work	☐	35/1 2
Newspaper or magazine article on social work careers	☐	36/1 2
Career-testing summer work experience in social work	☐	37/1 2
Speaker on social work:		
at high school	☐	38/1 2
at college	☐	39/1 2
at organization	☐	40/1 2
Career conference which covered social work:		
at high school	☐	41/1 2
at college	☐	42/1 2
at organization	☐	43/1 2
None of these	☐	44/

7. What kind of contact (if any) have you had with a community-sponsored Social Work Careers Program? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

A. Contacts with Social Work Careers Program

Had personal interview	☐	45/1 2
Participated in Summer Work Experience	☐	46/1 2
Received literature	☐	47/1 2
Other activity(specify) _____	☐	48/1 2
None	☐	49/

B. If you indicated above that you had contact with a Social Work Careers Program, in which city was the program located?

City _____ 50-51/

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

8. Is (or was) a member of your family or close personal friend employed as a social worker?

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	
Father employed in social work	☐	52/1 2
Mother employed in social work	☐	53/1 2
Husband or wife employed in social work	☐	54/1 2
Brother or Sister employed in social work	☐	55/1 2
Uncle or Aunt employed in social work	☐	56/1 2
In-laws (brother-in-law, mother-in-law, etc.), employed in social work	☐	57/1 2
Close friend employed in social work	☐	58/1 2
Other (specify) _____	☐	59/1 2
None employed as social workers	☐	60/

9. Indicate below whether you have had any direct work experience in social work or closely related activities in the following agencies.

CHECK APPROPRIATE COLUMN(S) FOR EACH AGENCY LISTED BELOW

Agencies	Full-time Paid	Part-time Paid	Summer Work Paid	Volunteer	None	
	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY					
Group Service (Y's, Scouts, Community Centers, Settlements).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	61/1 2 3 4 5
Public Assistance (Department of Welfare)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	62/1 2 3 4 5
Medical (include Public Health)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	63/1 2 3 4 5
Psychiatric (include Mental Health)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	64/1 2 3 4 5
Child Welfare	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	65/1 2 3 4 5
Family Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	66/1 2 3 4 5
Child and Family Welfare	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	67/1 2 3 4 5
Community Organization, Planning, or Development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	68/1 2 3 4 5
School Social Work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	69/1 2 3 4 5
Corrections	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	70/1 2 3 4 5
Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	71/1 2 3 4 5
None ☐	-	-	-	-	-	72/
						80/1

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

10. Indicate below whether you have ever received services from any of the following types of agencies.

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN
Group Service (Y's, Scouts, Community Centers, Settlements)	☐	6/1 2
Public Assistance (Department of Welfare)	☐	7/1 2
Medical (include Public Health)	☐	8/1 2
Psychiatric (include Mental Health)	☐	9/1 2
Child Welfare	☐	10/1 2
Family Services	☐	11/1 2
Child and Family Welfare	☐	12/1 2
Community Organization, Planning, or Development	☐	13/1 2
School Social Work	☐	14/1 2
Corrections	☐	15/1 2
Other (specify) _____	☐	16/1 2
None	☐	17/

11. Have you had any direct work experience with any of the following organizations?

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	
Peace Corps	☐	18/1 2
VISTA	☐	19/1 2
Community Action Program	☐	20/1 2
Other CEO Programs (Specify) _____	☐	21/1 2
No experience with any of these	☐	22/

12. Did you have any contact with any persons who graduated from a school of social work, during your experiences with the agencies or organizations listed in questions 9, 10, and 11?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Yes	☐	23/1
No	☐	2
Don't Know	☐	3
Had no experience with these organizations	☐	9

13. How active are you (or were you) in organizations in either college or the community?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Not active at all	☐	24/1
Somewhat active	☐	2
Quite active	☐	3

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

14. How often have you held leadership positions in organizations in either college or the community? CHECK ONLY ONE

- Hardly ever ☐ 25/1
- Occasionally ☐ 2
- Frequently ☐ 3

15. Indicate below whether you are (or were) a member of any of the following organizations in either college or the community? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- Student government ☐ 26/1 2
- Labor Unions ☐ 27/1 2
- Civil Rights groups ☐ 28/1 2
- Political groups ☐ 29/1 2
- Religious organizations ☐ 30/1 2
- Other (specify)_____ ☐ 31/1 2
- None of these ☐ 32/

16. When did you first become aware of social work as a career? CHECK ONLY ONE

- Prior to the last three years of high school ☐ 33/1
- During the last three years of high school ☐ 2
- During the first three years of college ☐ 3
- During last year of college ☐ 4
- After graduation from college ☐ 5
- Do not remember ☐ 9

17. When did you first consider social work as a possible career for you? CHECK ONLY ONE

- Prior to the last three years of high school ☐ 34/1
- During the last three years of high school ☐ 2
- During the first three years of college ☐ 3
- During the last year of college ☐ 4
- After graduation from college ☐ 5
- Do not remember ☐ 9

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

18. When did you definitely decide on social work as your career? CHECK ONLY ONE

Prior to the last three years of high school	☐	35/1
During the last three years of high school	☐	2
During the first three years of college	☐	3
During the last year of college	☐	4
After graduation from college	☐	5
Do not remember	☐	9

19. Indicate below whether you seriously considered another career before deciding on social work; whether you worked in another career; or whether you took courses in preparation for another career.

OTHER CAREERS	Considered CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	Worked	Took Courses	
Business	☐	☐	☐	36/1 2 3
Engineering	☐	☐	☐	37/1 2 3
Law	☐	☐	☐	38/1 2 3
Medicine	☐	☐	☐	39/1 2 3
Nursing	☐	☐	☐	40/1 2 3
Teaching	☐	☐	☐	41/1 2 3
Clergy	☐	☐	☐	42/1 2 3
Psychology	☐	☐	☐	43/1 2 3
Sociology	☐	☐	☐	44/1 2 3
Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐	45/1 2 3
None ☐	-	-	-	46/

IF YOU CHECKED MORE THAN ONE CAREER IN QUESTION NINETEEN, ANSWER QUESTION TWENTY FOR THE ONE CAREER YOU CONSIDERED OR TRIED MOST RECENTLY.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

20. What is the one major reason why you did not follow the career you considered or tried most recently? CHECK ONLY ONE

Tried it through study or work and did not like it or did not succeed	☐	47/1
Could not finance preparatory study	☐	2
Preparatory study is too long	☐	3
Was not admitted to preparatory study	☐	4
Learned about social work and considered myself better suited for it	☐	5
Learned about social work and considered it more important work	☐	6
Job opportunities, salaries and security better in social work	☐	7
Could not find employment	☐	8
Was offered employment in social work	☐	9
Other (specify) _____	☐	X
Did not consider or try another career	☐	Y

21. Which two of the following statements come closest to expressing the major reasons why you chose social work as your career? CHECK ONLY TWO

Social work is an interesting and exciting profession	☐	48/1 2
Social work will give me social status and prestige	☐	49/1 2
I think I can succeed in this kind of work	☐	50/1 2
Social work makes an important contribution to individuals and society	☐	51/1 2
Salaries and working conditions are good in social work	☐	52/1 2
I enjoy working with people	☐	53/1 2
I was offered a job in social work	☐	54/1 2
Social work can help me become a better person, parent, and marriage partner	☐	55/1 2
Job opportunities and job security are good in social work	☐	56/1 2
Other (specify) _____	☐	57/1 2

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

22. How did people close to you feel about your choice of a social work career?

FOR EACH PERSON OR GROUP LISTED BELOW CHECK ONLY ONE BOX IN APPLICABLE COLUMN.

	Approved	Mixed	Disapproved	No Opinion Feeling Unkown Does not apply	
Father	☐	☐	☐	☐	58/1 2 3 4
Mother	☐	☐	☐	☐	59/1 2 3 4
Relatives or family friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	60/1 2 3 4
Husband, wife, or fiancee	☐	☐	☐	☐	61/1 2 3 4
Personal friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	62/1 2 3 4
Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	63/1 2 3 4
School guidance staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	64/1 2 3 4
Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	65/1 2 3 4

23. In what method of social work are you concentrating your studies?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Casework	☐	66/1
Group Work	☐	2
Community Organization	☐	3
Administration	☐	4
Research	☐	5
Other or combined methods (specify)_____	☐	6
Not yet determined	☐	7
No special concentration required by school	☐	9

IF YOUR METHOD CONCENTRATION IS NOT YET DETERMINED OR NOT REQUIRED BY YOUR SCHOOL, SKIP TO QUESTION 29.

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

24. When did you make your choice of a social work method concentration?

CHECK ONLY ONE

- Before I thought about social work as my profession . . . . . ☐ 67/1
- At the same time I decided on social work as my career . . . . . ☐ 2
- After I decided about social work, but before I applied to a graduate school . . . . . ☐ 3
- At the time I filled out the written application for graduate school, but before my interview . . . . . ☐ 4
- During or after my interview but before admission . . . . . ☐ 5
- After official admission. . . . . ☐ 6
- Other (specify) _____ ☐ 7
- Method choice not determined or required. . . . . ☐ 9

25. Did you discuss your choice of social work method concentration in your admissions interview?

CHECK ONLY ONE

- Yes. . . . . ☐ 68/1
- No . . . . . ☐ 2
- Had no admissions interview. . . . ☐ 3

26. Did you discuss your choice of social work method concentration with any of the following?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- Friends or relatives. . . . . ☐ 69/1 2
- Other social workers . . . . . ☐ 70/1 2
- Other social work students. . . . . ☐ 71/1 2
- School faculty or administrative personnel . . . . . ☐ 72/1 2
- Other (specify)_____ ☐ 73/1 2
- Did not discuss with anyone . . . . . ☐ 74/

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

27. What was your major reason for choosing your social work method concentration? CHECK ONLY ONE

- I thought this would be the best way to carry out the goals of social work as I understand them . . . . . ☐ 75/1
- I thought my personality and background best fitted me for this method. . . . . ☐ 2
- I believed the salaries and opportunities for advancement would be best in this particular social work method . . . . ☐ 3
- I could get better financial support for this method . . . . . ☐ 4
- Other methods were not offered by the school . . . . . ☐ 5
- I did not know about other methods . . . . . ☐ 6
- Other (specify) _____ ☐ 7
- Method choice not determined or required . . . . . ☐ 9

28. When you selected the social work method in which to concentrate, to what extent were you awafe of other method concentrations? CHECK ONLY ONE

- I was about equally informed concerning all methods . . . . . ☐ 76/1
- I did not know as much about the other methods as the one selected. . . . . ☐ 2
- I did not know other methods were available. . . . . ☐ 3
- Method choice not determined or required . . . . . ☐ 9

80/2

29. From what kind of educational institution did you receive your undergraduate degree? CHECK ONLY ONE

- Private liberal arts college not part of university. . . . . ☐ 6/1
- City, county, or state college not part of university. . . . . ☐ 2
- Private university . . . . . ☐ 3
- Public university. . . . . ☐ 4
- Teachers college . . . . . ☐ 5
- Institution outside the U. S. or Canada. . . . . ☐ 6
- Other (specify)_____ ☐ 7

30. What was name and location of the educational institution from which you received your undergraduate degree? PLEASE WRITE IN.

Name _____ 7/

City _____ State _____
or country if not U. S. or Canada

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

31. Indicate below your undergraduate college program grade average, for the four year period and for the last two years?

IF GRADING SYSTEM WAS NUMERIC, CONVERT TO COMPARABLE LETTER GRADE.

Grade	CHECK ONLY ONE Four Year Average	Grade	CHECK ONLY ONE Last Two Years Average		
A+	☐	A+	☐	8/1	9/1
A	☐	A	☐	2	2
A-	☐	A-	☐	3	3
B+	☐	B+	☐	4	4
B	☐	B	☐	5	5
B-	☐	B-	☐	6	6
C+	☐	C+	☐	7	7
C	☐	C	☐	8	8
C-	☐	C-	☐	9	9
D	☐	D	☐	X	X
				10/	

32. What was your "major" in your undergraduate program? CHECK ONLY ONE

Social Science (e.g.,psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, political science, economics)	☐	11/1
Social Work or Social Welfare	☐	2
Physical Science (e.g., physics, chemistry)	☐	3
Biological Science (e.g., zoology, biology)	☐	4
English and Literature	☐	5
Foreign Languages	☐	6
Mathematics	☐	7
Fine Arts	☐	8
Education	☐	9
Business	☐	X
Other (specify) _____	☐	
No major subject area	☐	Y

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

33. How many undergraduate courses did you take in each of the following subject areas?

FOR EACH SUBJECT AREA BELOW, CHECK ONLY ONE COLUMN.

	No Courses	One to three Courses	Four or more Courses	
Social Work or Social Welfare . .	☐	☐	☐	12/1 2 3
Psychology.	☐	☐	☐	13/1 2 3
Sociology	☐	☐	☐	14/1 2 3
Anthropology.	☐	☐	☐	15/1 2 3
History	☐	☐	☐	16/1 2 3
Political Science	☐	☐	☐	17/1 2 3
Economics	☐	☐	☐	18/1 2 3

34. Indicate below whether you hold a master's degree or doctorate in some field other than social work.

CHECK YES OR NO

Master's Degree	Yes ☐	No ☐	19/1 2
Doctorate	Yes ☐	No ☐	20/1 2

35. How old were you when you graduated from college? _____years. 21-22/

36. How old are you now? _____years. 23-24/

25/

37. If after you graduated from college, you took a full time job in social work, other than summer employment, indicate the major reasons that led you to work, instead of going directly to a graduate school of social work.

CHECK ONLY ONE

I was not sure of my career decision	☐	26/1
I did not want to take graduate work at that time.	☐	2
I wanted some work experience before starting graduate school.	☐	3
I was not financially able to go to graduate school	☐	4
I was not accepted in a school of social work	☐	5
Other (specify)_____	☐	6
Did not take a full time job	☐	9

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

38. Upon graduation in what field of practice do you plan to work?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Group Service (Y's, Scouts, Community Centers, Settlements)	☐	27/1
Public Assistance (Department of Welfare)	☐	2
Medical (include Public Health)	☐	3
Psychiatric (include Mental Health)	☐	4
Child Welfare	☐	5
Family Services	☐	6
Child and Family Welfare	☐	7
Community Organization, Planning, or Development	☐	8
School Social Work	☐	9
Corrections	☐	X
Other (specify) _____	☐	Y

39. At what level of practice would you like to engage? ANSWER A. & B.

	A. Upon graduation CHECK ONLY ONE	B. At the peak of your career CHECK ONLY ONE		
Direct Practice	☐	☐	28/1	29/1
Supervision	☐	☐	2	2
Consultation	☐	☐	3	3
Administration	☐	☐	4	4
Teaching	☐	☐	5	5
Research	☐	☐	6	6
Undecided	☐	☐	7	7

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

40. Under what agency auspices would you plan to work in your first job after graduation?

CHECK ONLY ONE

- Federal government . . . . . ☐ 30/1
- State or local government . . . . . ☐ 2
- Voluntary Non-Sectarian Agency:
  - at National level . . . . . ☐ 3
  - at State or local level . . . . ☐ 4
- Voluntary Sectarian Agency:
  - at National level . . . . . ☐ 5
  - at State or local level . . . . ☐ 6
- Educational institution . . . . . ☐ 7
- Outside of social welfare field . . . . . ☐ 8
- Other (specify) _____ ☐ x
- Unsure. . . . . ☐ 9

41. About what annual salary would you expect to receive in your first job after graduating from the school of social work?

JUST GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE Annual Salary $_____ 31/

42. Outside of financial aid (from a school, agency, foundation, etc.), how are you financing your professional education?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- Earnings of husband or wife. . . . . ☐ 32/1 2
- Support from parents or relatives. . . . . ☐ 33/1 2
- Personal savings . . . . . ☐ 34/1 2
- Borrowed funds . . . . . ☐ 35/1 2
- G I Bill, including extension. . . . . ☐ 36/1 2
- Part-time job in social work . . . . . ☐ 37/1 2
- Part-time job outside of social work.. . . . . ☐ 38/1 2
- Other (specify)_____ ☐ 39/1 2
- No other financing . . . . . ☐ 40/

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

43. What is the amount of your financial aid to meet tuition and/or expenses for your first year of full time study?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
up to $ 499	☐	41/1
$ 500 to $ 999	☐	2
$1,000 to $1,999	☐	3
$2,000 to $2,999	☐	4
$3,000 to $3,999	☐	5
$4,000 to $4,999	☐	6
over $5,000	☐	7
No financial aid	☐	9

IF "NO FINANCIAL AID" IS CHECKED ABOVE SKIP TO QUESTION 50

44. What is the source of the major portion of your financial aid to meet tuition and/or expenses for your first year of full time study?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Federal government	☐	42/1
State or local government	☐	2
National voluntary welfare agency	☐	3
Local voluntary welfare agency	☐	4
School of social work or university	☐	5
Foundation or non-social welfare organization	☐	6
Other (specify) _____	☐	7
No financial aid	☐	9

45. Which item below most nearly describes the nature of the major financial aid you are presently receiving?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Scholorship (based on need)	☐	43/1
Fellowship (not based on need)	☐	2
Field work stipend (paid field work)	☐	3
Work-study plan	☐	4
Loan	☐	5
Educational leave with pay	☐	6
Other (specify) _____	☐	7
No financial aid	☐	9

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

46. What is the particular method of social work (if any) to which you are limited by your grant?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Administration	☐	44/1
Casework	☐	2
Community organization	☐	3
Group work	☐	4
Research	☐	5
Other (specify) _____	☐	6
No limitation	☐	9

47. What is the particular field of social work practice (if any), to which you are limited by your grant?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Group Services (Y's, Scouts, Community Centers, and Settlements.)	☐	45/1
Public Assistance (Department of Welfare)	☐	2
Medical (include Public Health)	☐	3
Psychiatric (include Mental Health)	☐	4
Child Welfare	☐	5
Family Services	☐	6
Child and Family Welfare	☐	7
Community organization, Planning, or Development	☐	8
School Social Work	☐	X
Corrections	☐	Y
Other (specify) _____	☐	
No limitation	☐	9

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

48. What is the nature of employment, if any, to which you are limited by your grant?

To seek or accept employment in:	CHECK ONLY ONE	
An agency located in a particular local community	☐	46/1
An agency located in a particular State	☐	2
A specific social agency	☐	3
An agency in a common group of agencies, (e.g., Jewish Community Centers, Lutheran Child Welfare Services, etc.)	☐	4
Other (specify)_____	☐	5
No limitation	☐	9

49. Had you not received financial aid what would you have done?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
I would have managed this year without financial difficulty	☐	47/1
I would have managed this year, but with some financial difficulty	☐	2
I could have undertaken graduate education only with extreme financial hardship, but would have managed somehow	☐	3
I would have been unable to undertake graduate education because of inability to finance it	☐	4
I did not receive financial aid	☐	9

PERSONAL HISTORY QUESTIONS

Please answer the following personal history questions. Your answers are confidential and will be used for statistical analyses only.

50. Sex . . . . . Male ☐ Female ☐ 48/1 2

51. Current marital status.

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Single - never married	☐	49/1
Married	☐	2
Widowed	☐	3
Separated or divorced	☐	4

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

52. If you are married or have been, how many children do you have under 21 years of age?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
One child	☐	50/1
Two children	☐	2
Three children	☐	3
Four or more children	☐	4
No children	☐	5
All children are over 21 years of age	☐	8
Never married	☐	9

53. Religious identification.

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Catholic	☐	51/1
Jewish	☐	2
Protestant	☐	3
Other (specify) _____	☐	4
None	☐	5

54. Racial Background

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Negro	☐	52/1
White	☐	2
Other (specify) _____	☐	

55. What was the size of the community which you think of as your home town during high school days?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Village (less than 5,000)	☐	53/1
Small town (5,000-9,999)	☐	2
Town (10,000 - 49,999)	☐	3
Small city (50,000 - 99,999)	☐	4
City (100,000 - 499,999)	☐	5
Large city (500,000 - 2 million)	☐	6
Metropolitan City (more than 2 million)	☐	7

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

56. In what part of the country have you lived most of your life? CHECK ONLY ONE

New England (Maine, N. H., Mass., R. I., Conn., Vermont)	☐	54/1
Middle Atlantic (N. Y., N. J., Pa., Delaware, Md., W.Va., District of Columbia)	☐	2
Southeast (Va., N. C., S. C., Ga., Fla., Ky., Tenn., Ala., Miss., Ark., La.)	☐	3
Southwest (Okla., Tex., New Mexico, Arizona)	☐	4
Central (Ohio, Ind., Ill., Mich., Wisc., Minn., Iowa, Mo.)	☐	5
Northwest (N. D., S.D., Neb., Kan., Mont., Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah)	☐	6
Far West (Washington, Oreg., Nev., Calif., Hawaii, Alaska)	☐	7
Canada	☐	8
Puerto Rico	☐	9
Country other than U.S., Canada, or Puerto Rico	☐	X

57. Were either your mother or father (or both) born in a country other than the United States, Puerto Rico, or Canada? CHECK ONLY ONE

Yes ☐ No ☐ 55/1 2

58. How many older and younger brothers and/or sisters do you have?

CHECK ONE ITEM IN APPLICABLE COLUMN

ANSWER A. & B.	None	One or Two	Three or More	
A. Older brothers and/or sisters.	☐	☐	☐	56/0 1 2 3
B. Younger brothers and/or sisters	☐	☐	☐	57/0 1 2 3
				58/

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

59. What is, (or was), the occupation of your father? CHECK ONLY ONE

Professional person (e.g., doctor, teacher, lawyer, minister, scientist)	☐	59/1
Proprietor, manager, or official (e.g., owner, banker, army officer, city or union official)	☐	2
Clerical, sales, and kindred worker (e.g., bookkeeper, secretary, insurance agent, salesman)	☐	3
Farmer or farm manager	☐	4
Skilled or semi-skilled worker (e.g., craftsman, barber, jeweler, bartender, plumber)	☐	5
Unskilled worker (e.g., laborer, porter)	☐	6

60. What is the combined approximate income of your parents? CHECK ONLY ONE

Up to $ 3,000	☐	60/1
More than $3,000 and up to $5,000	☐	2
More than 5,000 and up to $7,000	☐	3
More than $7,000 and up to $10,000	☐	4
More than $10,000 and up to $20,000	☐	5
More than $20,000	☐	6
Do not know	☐	7
Father retired or deceased	☐	8

61. What is the highest level of educat on achieved by your parents?

ANSWER A. & B.

	A. Father CHECK ONLY ONE	B. Mother CHECK ONLY ONE		
Never attended high school	☐	☐	61/1	62/1
Attended high school	☐	☐	2	2
Completed high school	☐	☐	3	3
Attended college	☐	☐	4	4
Completed college	☐	☐	5	5
Did graduate work	☐	☐	6	6
Do not know	☐	☐	7	7

#66-111-1

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN

62. How would you classify your family's general socio-economic position when you were grow_ng up?

	CHECK ONLY ONE	
Lower Lower	☐	63/1
Middle Lower	☐	2
Upper Lower	☐	3
Lower Middle	☐	4
Middle Middle	☐	5
Upper Middle	☐	6
Lower Upper	☐	7
Middle Upper	☐	8
Upper Upper	☐	9

80/3

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE FILL IN THE ENCLOSED BLUE RESPONSE CARD. To keep this questionnaire anonymous, turn in the card and the questionnaire separately.